／# INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 4. (NEW SERIES.) APRIL, 1896. Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	97
The Enigma of "Loss by Exchange," by Sir J. B. Phear	102
Looking Backwards—I, by A. O. Hume, C.B.	104
Land Revenue Assessment in Madras, by Alexander Rogers	105
The Abolition of Trial by Jury, by A. Nundy	107
English Ignorance of India, by an Independent Politician	109
"All Members for India"!	110
The Judiciary and the Executive	112
The Real Motive Power	113
Congress Addresses	115
Buddhist Lore	117
The Invasion of Kafiristan	118
The Cotton Duties	119
The Scope of the "Mandate"	121
Our London Letter	123
The Indian Budget	124
Simultaneous Examinations	126
Resolutions of the Poona Congress	126
Reviews: Charles Bradlaugh	126
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	128

Indiana.

The Indian Budget.

Sir James Westland presented in the Legislative Council of the Governor-General on March 18th his financial statement for 1896-7. We print elsewhere the brief telegraphic summary which was sent, according to custom, to the Secretary of State. The details of the Budget will be more properly criticised when we have before us the full text of Sir J. Westland's statement, and the report of the debate in the Legislative Council. Meantime, however, there are one or two points which obviously call for notice. The financial statement "begins," we are told,

> "by announcing the restoration of the Famine Insurance Grant, with effect from the date of its suspension. The amount will, however, for the present be taken at Rx. 1,000,000 instead of Rx. 1,500,000, this amount being considered, on a review of fifteen years' transactions, to make sufficient provision for present needs."

"Restoration" is rather good—after the reiterated assertions of the Government of India during recent years that there was no such thing as a Famine Insurance Fund, and that any contributions which it might be handsome enough to make to famine insurance must be produced by a surplus. We venture to congratulate the Government of India upon admitting, however tardily, the force of the criticisms consistently urged by the Indian National Congress and in these columns. That "restoration" is the right word is conclusively shown by the history of the Famine Insurance Fund. Those who wish to look closely into the subject may consult INDIA for July, 1894 (p. 218). Here we may note the terms employed by Sir John Strachey when he presented his Financial Statement in 1877 and explained the new taxation for famine insurance:

> "I hope," he said, "that no desire to carry out any administrative improvement, however urgent, or any fiscal reform, however wise, will tempt the Government to neglect this sacred trust."

Similarly, Lord Lytton, in his Minute of March 12th, 1878, recorded on behalf of the Government of India, the following pledge:—

> "To apply sums from the surplus revenues at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions sterling per annum in such a manner as to create what shall be, in fact, an insurance fund, from which future expenditure for famine relief can be provided for without adding to the permanent burden of the revenues."

Yet these sums have not been applied. On the contrary, the "sacred trust" has been neglected, though not for any administrative improvement nor for any fiscal reform. It is military expenditure, especially in Burma and beyond the North-west frontier, that has played havoc with the Famine Insurance Fund. Even the "restoration" is only at the rate of Rx.1,000,000 instead of (not Rx.1,500,000 as Sir J. Westland appears oddly to have suggested, but) "$1\frac{1}{2}$ million sterling"—a very different thing. Still, it is something for the Government of India to resolve to do right by halves.

The Cost of Aggression.

The grim wolf of military aggression has, as Sir James Westland's statement shows, devoured no small amount of the revenues of India during the past year, and its privy paw is upon the new Budget. The charges for the Chitral expedition are stated in the revised estimate for 1895-96 at Rx. 1,750,000 + £16,000 sterling. This sum contrasts rather painfully with the original estimate of Rx. 150,000, and and there is, of course, more to follow. Mr. Balfour, to be sure, said in his airy way at Glasgow last November that the expense of the Chitral operation was "absoluely insignificant." He was thinking, no doubt, of that egregious estimate of Rx. 150,000. He added that the retention of Chitral would not involve the "augmentation of the Indian army" by one single soldier. If that is so, the Indian army must have been too large before. But Lord Salisbury has reminded us to beware of the estimates of statesmen for projects upon which they have set their hearts. Besides, if the retention of Chitral was, as Mr. Balfour argued, dictated by the "prestige" of the British Empire, why should India pay the whole of the bill? The new Budget sets apart Rx. 495,000 for mobilization, "a large programme of railway capital expenditure is laid down," and it is announced that "a rupee loan of four crores will be raised in India." These items, among others, will need close scrutiny. As for the surplus, the only thing that is yet certain about it is that we must not thank the Government of India for it, as the following figures show:—

Surplus (as advertised)........	Rx. 693,000
Unexpected saving on Exchange	Rx. 1,436,000
	Rx. 743,000

In other words, if it had not been for the windfall from unexpected improvement in Exchange, it looks as if the Government of India would have produced a deficit of Rx. 743,000. As the Government estimated not for equilibrium but for a surplus of Rx. 991,000, this is rather a large order. The Budget estimate for military expenditure is 24 crores 29 lakhs. "It is remarked," says the correspondent of the *Times*, "that military expenditure in India continues to increase." It does indeed.

"Of their own accord."

We wrote last month, with reference to the optimism of the Queen's Speech and of Lord George Hamilton, that we had not done with Chitral yet. The Queen's Speech said that "the engagements entered into by the border tribes for the maintenance and protection of the road from Peshawar" had been "carried out without molestation or disturbance." As for Lord George Hamilton's statement, we cannot do better than place it by the side of the more cautious, and certainly not less well informed, opinion of the *Pioneer*:—

LORD G. HAMILTON. *February 17th.*	THE "PIONEER." *January 30th.*
"The Government had succeeded in making an excellent road from Peshawar to Chitral, and the tribes through whose territory it had passed had of their own accord undertaken to protect it."	"By next June we shall know whether the peace that has reigned since the Field Force was withdrawn is illusory or not."

But that is not all, nor the worst. The *Pioneer* of February 20th publishes an article "calculating the chances of disturbances when the Chitral Reliefs are being carried out." The writer reflects with satisfaction, not that the tribesmen are friendly, but that "there will be a considerable force along the line of communications" and that "the tribesmen will have no temptation to attack small detachments." The regiments are to "join hands," and "if trouble threatens" General Waterfield will have "a very useful force, composed of a mountain battery, two squadrons of cavalry, and six regiments of infantry under his orders." These prudential measures contrast strangely with Lord G. Hamilton's sanguine statements in the House of Commons, which were as follows:—

"There had been a difference between the Indian Government and the tribes as regarded the Proclamation, but only in one sense. The heads of the tribes petitioned the Political officer, asking to be incorporated in British territory. They said they had felt such advantage and sense of security from the presence of the troops, and no doubt from the better prices they got for their produce, that they thought they would like to have these benefits permanently. They were told it was impossible they could be so incorporated."

So greatly did the indigenous tribes appreciate the "advantages" and the "benefits" of invasion that our troops, on passing through their territory, anticipate a reception of excessive warmth. The *Pioneer* thinks that there may not, after all, be any disturbances. Why not? Because of the friendliness of the tribes, and their appreciation of the "advantages" and "benefits" aforesaid? Not a bit of it—but because

"Major Deane, Political Officer, has the tribesmen well in hand; and even the fanatical sections must recognise that it would be foolish in the extreme to show their teeth when more troops than usual would be on the line of communication."

Yet these are our very humble and obedient servants who "had of their own accord undertaken to protect" the road. Poor Lord George Hamilton!

The Indian Parliamentary Committee.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee, which was formed in July, 1893, has received a considerable accession of strength from the new members of the House of Commons. A circular letter, containing a brief statement of the origin and aims of the Com-

mittee, was sent by Sir W. Wedderburn on March 19th, to a selected number of new members, with an invitation that they should join it. The response has, so far, been highly satisfactory, as the following list of gentlemen who have intimated their willingness to become members of the Committee shows:

Ashton, T. G.	Lambert, G.
Bainbridge, E.	Langley, Batty.
Brigg, J.	Leuty, T. R.
Burt, T.	McKenna, R.
Caldwell, J.	Macleod, J.
Cawley, F. W.	Morgan, J. Lloyd.
Colville, J.	Robson, W. S.
Davies, M. Vaughan.	Samuel, J.
Goddard, D. F.	Scott, C. P.
Gold, C.	Souttar, R.
Gourley, Sir E. T.	Ure, A.
Harwood, G.	Wayman, T.
Hazell, W.	White, J. M.
Holborn, J. G.	Williams, J. Carvell.
Horniman, J. F.	Wilson, F. W.
Jacoby, J. A.	Yoxall, J. H.
Jones, W.	

The Indian Parliamentary Committee is now more than a hundred strong, and cannot fail to exercise a highly important influence upon Indian business in the House of Commons. Never, certainly, was there a time when greater vigilance and activity were necessary on the part of members interested in the welfare of India. At the end of February Mr. Balfour introduced in the House of Commons certain new rules of procedure which, incidentally, have the effect of preventing any Indian discussion upon Friday evenings. Sir W. Wedderburn, whose speech on the subject is reported in our Parliamentary Supplement, asked Mr. Balfour what he proposed to do for "the most oppressed minority in the House"—the group of members who are interested in Indian questions. Mr. Balfour, apparently, proposes to do nothing. Sir W. Wedderburn urged with point and force that members who endeavour to further the interests of India need the fullest indulgence of the House of Commons. They have no voters behind them, and they deliberately risk the danger of being regarded as bores. The truth is, of course, that the House of Commons will never be brought to pay anything like adequate attention to Indian policy and administration until the salary, or a part of the salary, of the Secretary of State is placed, as it ought to be, upon the regular Estimates. Will Lord Welby's Commission recommend that salutary course?

"Come over and Help us."

"I lament," said Lord Rosebery in his speech at the dinner of the Eighty Club on March 3rd, "I lament the growing burdens of the country. I lament that in Parliament there is no voice raised for economy now on any question whatever, and I sometimes rub my eyes when I see on the publications of the Cobden Club that motto of 'peace, retrenchment, and reform'—a large part of which seems to have dropped out of the portable baggage of politicians." Lord Rosebery does not lament without reason. The voices which used to be heard in Parliament on behalf of economy are now hushed, and those who might have been expected to succeed to their task are too often mute where they are not actually found on the side of lavish expenditure. But let us not, for all that, overstate the case. When Lord Rosebery declares roundly that "in Parliament there is no voice raised for economy now on any question whatever" he does—unintentionally, of course—an injustice to the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. They, at any rate, have remained firm where others falter, loyal where others betray, and if Lord Rosebery would add his powerful influence to theirs in that Chamber where, as Lord Coleridge said, the voice of the people is but faintly heard, British as well as Indian taxpayers would be the gainers. Meantime, we are indebted to Lord Rosebery for an admirable maxim which, if we may adapt a suggestion of Lord Salisbury's, should be inscribed in the India Office in letters three feet long:

> "I have always believed that you will never subject your votes in Supply to a real and searching criticism until you discuss them by Grand or Standing Committees outside the walls of the House of Commons, with the necessary permanent officials in attendance to give you their information."

Exactly; and if such a plan is expedient to secure "real and searching criticism" of home expenditure, which touches the pockets of electors and therefore comes home to the business and bosoms of their representatives, how much more necessary is it in the case of Indian expenditure, which now comes before the House of Commons as a foregone conclusion, which is not in the control of the Indian people, and which is hurried through the Legislative Council without the possibility of amendment or division? The plan which Lord Rosebery thus suggests applies *a fortiori* to the Indian Budget, and it is the plan which has long been advocated by Indian public opinion and by members of Parliament interested in the welfare of India. Perhaps Lord Rosebery will, on behalf of the Indian National Congress, attend and give evidence before Lord Welby's Commission. Why not?

The Cotton Duties.

A Bombay correspondent writes on March 7th: "The air is clearer now after the recent agitation regarding the iniquitous legislation on the cotton duties. But there is not the least doubt that a strong feeling of indignation against the Government has been evoked

in every nook and corner of the country. Popular sentiment is naturally enraged by the altogether inexcusable conduct of our rulers. It is now manifest that the recent legislation was cut-and-dry in Calcutta when the Government was asking the Mill-owners' Association and the Chambers of Commerce to give a reply to the allegations of Manchester. The people are sore at this discreditable conduct, and they are infinitely more so at the way in which the duties have been re-arranged. Thus, while criticism on the Act has subsided, there is still a strong agitation in many towns and villages for boycott of Lancashire goods. Leagues and associations are being formed for the purpose of avoiding Lancashire fabrics and confining consumption to India-made products. Whatever may be the result of this movement, it has its source in widespread popular indignation. People are freely giving vent to what they think and feel on the subject. The spirit of hatred to British rule is predominant, and, in my opinion, the Government of Lord Elgin never did a more imprudent thing than readjusting the cotton duties in the way they have done. It has exasperated the people. It has sown a new seed of discontent, which is likely to grow to grave proportions. The truth is that want of true statesmanship is fast bringing the Government of India into contempt. Its benevolent despotism is bitterly criticised. But our rulers are either dead to these facts, or, being alive to them, affect to treat the consequences lightly. But there can be no doubt that at present the feeling of genuine attachment to British rule is diminishing, and that the Government has only itself to blame.

The Jhalawar Case.

"Equally ominous signs of disaffection may be perceived among our Native Chiefs and Princes. The deposition of the Chief of Jhalawar is agitating all the Native States. Questions in Parliament have received the usual and stereotyped answer. Of course, it was to be expected that the Government would "justify its action." When has it not? What happened in Kashmir? What happened in Manipur? What happened in minor principalities? The Government only gives its own version of these transactions—a version which needs to be supplemented by independent testimony. The version of the aggrieved party is never told, or, if it is told, it is by his accusers, who are at once judge and jury. The Jhalawar case is only one more instance of official autocracy in Native States, but it is creating an intense feeling against the British *raj*. It is refined Russianism, and no more. But the Russian makes no declaration of benevolent despotism. He speaks frankly of despotism pure and simple, and declares that those who are subject to it must abide by it for better or for worse. The Government of India, on the contrary, proclaims from the housetop that there is not an alien government on the face of the earth which is more impartial, more just, or more benevolent than itself.

Lord Sandhurst's Success.

"In Madras they are reproducing the agitation which occurred here on the eve of the departure of Lord Harris,—I mean the apotheosis of Lord Wenlock. We are better off in Bombay now. Lord Sandhurst is daily adding to his genuine popularity. He is already a favourite. He is 'the people's man' and our native journals are loud in his praises. He has now revived the old practice, in vogue in Sir Bartle Frere's time, of inviting well-known citizens to breakfast, and thus endeavouring privately to acquaint himself with the thoughts and feelings of the community. This is a step in the right direction. His liberal temper has wrought a healthy change among colleagues in the Executive Council. What with the pertinacity of our public-spirited non-official representatives, and Lord Sandhurst's own sympathy, tact, and judgment, the answers to interpellations are becoming less vague and equivocal. There is more definiteness and candour in them. As a result, public business is facilitated while public time is more usefully employed. It was a popular triumph that the unofficial members compelled Mr. Nugent, the revenue member, to abandon his Karachi Port Trust Bill which sought to deprive the Karachi municipality of its privilege of returning two members to the Port Trust Board. Wonderful to relate, Mr. Nugent further declared that hurried legislation, like hurried matrimony, was much to be deprecated. Imagine this robust bureaucrat, this pillar of Lord Harris's Government, now the opponent of hurried legislation. We owe this miraculous transformation to Lord Sandhurst."

British Troops in India.

"Truth in parentheses" may be found in many places other than in Tom Hood's sprightly verses. It is (writes an Anglo-Indian correspondent) a happy foible of the human mind, one unconsciously leaning to virtue's side, that causes some writers, while devoting all their attention to some object of pride, prejudice, or professional zeal, to drop by the way some remark or phrase of far more significance than the special doxy they are intent on preaching. One little incident of this sort occurred in one of the large-type letters recently appearing in the *Times*, relating to the change in the position and functions of the Commander-in-Chief. The military critic who obscured his, no doubt, weighty identity under the signature "Reform," gave us this striking line—

"the only really efficient portion of the army, that in India." This statement is as true as hard fact can make it; but its avowal may be new to many, and few of our public men, civil or military, realize its significance. How many members of the House of Commons, I wonder, when voting annually to fix the "strength" of the British Army bethink themselves that from one-fourth to one-third of that strength is paid for by India. For 1894 the total "effective strength" is given in the returns as 219,400; but this includes the Head-quarters Staff, the Household Troops, the Army Service Corps, Medical Staff and other addenda. If we deduct for the purpose of a comparison, the total would fall short of 200,000. Of these 77,250 in 1894 were returned under the head of "East India." Thus more than one-third of what the gallant correspondent of the *Times* described as "the only really efficient portion of the (British) Army" is, as he says, "in India," and is maintained, not from our overflowing Treasury, but by our unrepresented dependency.

"The only efficient portion."

Here (our correspondent continues) we have a telling illustration of what India is worth to this country. But how very few of our politicians and taxpayers think of these things. Yet this great factor in our Imperial strength, financially, is well understood by Continental statesmen, and, it may be, explains some of that envy and covetousness with which their press girds against our Empire. The least that can be expected of our statesmen and electors, those of Lancashire included, is that they should bear in mind India's contribution to that yet unwearied Titan, the British Empire. Possibly they may come to see that far too large a share is paid by the weak and subordinate partner, and, if they do see this, it should be easy for them to be so far generous in their strength as to be willing to defray, at least, that portion of Indian Military Expenditure which is paid and spent in this country—especially the Rx.250,000, representing "compensation allowance," besides as much more for "extra pay" to the rank and file which comes under "exchange." Possibly some will say: But these troops are necessary for the defence of India, that is, for "our Indian possessions." To this the obvious rejoinder arises: if these are *our* possessions, why should not *we* pay for their defence? But to press this point would shock the Philistine official mind. For the present, then, I rest content with the very moderate suggestion of generosity hinted at above. One word more: in case our statesmen should blunder into a European war, would not the defence of India have to take care of itself, whilst a large part of "the only really efficient portion of the British army" would be speedily withdrawn to repair the damage of such blunder?

India pays the Bill.

The considerations indicated above derive fresh illustration from certain passages in the elaborate statement recently made to the House of Commons by the Under-Secretary for War, Mr. St. John Brodrick. The speech was chiefly devoted to financial details and one does not gather from it any precise indication of the whole strength of the British army. The numbers given by the Under-Secretary were 333,000 at home and in garrison, 38,400 Colonies and Egypt, and 90,000 the depôts and staff, making a total of 461,400 men. But this number evidently does not include the 74,000 serving in India, every shilling of whose pay, share of pensions, and other charges is borne by the Indian taxpayer. This consideration should ever be borne in mind, namely, that when Parliament votes, pursuant to the Mutiny Act, the total number of troops of the British army, from one-fourth to one-third of these are paid for by India, and do not come as a charge on the British taxpayer. Sir Charles Dilke, who understands the position as well as anybody, incidentally and for the purpose of his financial argument treated the subject in this way:—

> "For his own part, he would lump together the expenditure for the home army and the Indian army, and he found that, while the results had been far more satisfactory in India than at home, the expenditure upon land forces in both countries was larger than that of any other Power—namely, about £36,000,000, which would probably be increased next year."

Mr. Brodrick stated the total army charges at a neat eighteen millions sterling, and Sir Charles Dilke "lumps" the cost of the Indian armies at the same sum. This interesting coincidence need not be examined too closely. But it may be noted that the Indian cost, as just stated by Sir James Westland, stands at 24·29 crores of rupees. Of that vast sum only about a third, roughly speaking, is convertible into sterling. So that Sir Charles Dilke's lumping the whole into eighteen millions sterling does not help us very much. There is great risk of serious error in expressing Indian expenditure in sterling. Sir James Westland had a lesson to that effect last year which he will not readily forget. It is worth noting that Sir C. Dilke testifies that "the results had been far more satisfactory in India." That is only another way of stating, as we have seen above, that "the only really efficient portion of our army is in India," and British taxpayers must remember that India pays for it Yet what happens is that India is, for Imperial purposes, not only permanently burdened with an unnecessarily large army, but when her troops are employed on expeditions, not of her seeking, beyond the frontier, India pays the bill. Hence, *inter alia*, the cotton duties.

THE ENIGMA OF "LOSS BY EXCHANGE."

By Sir J. B. Phear.
Late Chief Justice of Ceylon.

The time of the year is at hand when the financial authorities of India are accustomed, (1) To prepare a budget estimate of India's Revenue and Expenditure for the coming financial year; (2) To revise the like estimate which was last year made for the financial year just now about to expire; (3) To ascertain and discuss the completed accounts of the preceding year. When the Secretary of State for India last autumn presented to the House of Commons his explanatory statement of the annual triplet of accounts and estimates which had thus been produced at the preceding Lady Day, he appeared to make the remarkable confession that there was in the finances of India a certain item of aggregate charge, amounting in the whole to as much as 13 crores of rupees, which transcended his powers of comprehension and eluded the control of the Indian Government and its expert advisers. He is reported to have said in the course of his speech,

> "There is certain expenditure which is under the control of the Indian Government and there is a certain charge which is not. That which is not under their control is the increased expenditure relating to exchange."

And again:—

> "Right through the statement the one difficulty with which Government has to contend is the fall in exchange. It has a blighting and withering influence in every direction."

And elsewhere he said that the "loss by exchange" for the financial year 1895-96 was estimated at Rx.2,503,700.

It is perhaps not wonderful that obscurity should be the result of a financial explanation in which the terms "loss by exchange" and "charge for exchange" play the principal part, when we find that loss by exchange here spoken of is no loss at all, but merely the excess in the so-called charge for exchange of one year over that of the preceding, arising from, and indeed identical with, a fall in the rate of exchange; while charge for exchange is itself an artificial item of account, created merely for the purpose, so far as can be perceived, of exhibiting items of sterling and rupee expenditure together in the same balance-sheet. It is in fact the numerical excess by which the actual rupee cost of things and services, that have to be paid for in England with the exchange at something more than Rs. 10 per £, is greater than the amount in rupees which would have been the cost of the same things, etc., had the exchange between the two countries been at the lower rate of exactly Rs.10 per £.

To state the same thing another way. In order to make a payment of one-tenth £ (*i.e.*, 2s. or 24d.) in England the Indian Government has, under the market rates of exchange which have prevailed of late years, had to expend one rupee *plus* a fraction of a rupee in India. Thus the one rupee, *plus* a fraction of a rupee, is the charge which the Government has to meet in India in order to obtain in exchange the payment of one-tenth of a £ in England; and obviously the two parts of this item are not properly separable. But in these accounts and estimates of the Indian Government the fractional part is entered by itself as the charge for exchange, and the integral part, one rupee, goes down as the cost of the article for which the one-tenth of a £ is paid!

Not only does this method of presenting the accounts seem to be without satisfactory justification in itself, but it serves to foster the mischievous notion that there is a normal rate of exchange, which ought for some reason to obtain between Indian money and English money, namely, one rupee for one-tenth of a sovereign; and that any deviation from this rate in the shape of either addition to or deduction from the rupee is a matter of chance not to be explained, but to be accepted as a loss or a gain, as the case may be.

Indeed, the natural inference from the Secretary of State's own language would be that in his view for every two shillings of what may be termed the English expenditure, which costs one rupee, *plus* a fraction, in India, although the Government has control of the one rupee, it has no control and no foreknowledge in respect of the additional fraction of a rupee. And any increase in the fraction beyond what was anticipated he sets down as a loss.

But the question may be fairly asked: if the Government of India has, for instance, sustained a loss of Rx.2,503,700 during the present financial year by reason of a fall in the exchange, who has gained that sum? And if no one can be shown to have gained it, what has become of it?

In truth, this sum of rupees, which the Secretary of State speaks of as a loss by exchange, is, as has been already indicated, only a small portion arbitrarily separated from the total aggregate cost in rupees of material and services paid for in England—so separated and called a loss attributable to exchange because, if the rate of exchange had not altered, the cost in rupees of the same sterling expenditure in England would have been less by that sum. But the rate of exchange between the two countries is directly dependent upon the sterling prices of things on the one side and the rupee prices of things on the other, and alteration in the rate means alteration of some sort in those prices; and the alteration in prices, which brings about the fall in exchange, may be nevertheless such as to leave the return for the expenditure of one rupee the same as it was before, in which case the so-called "loss" would simply mean increased quantity of material and services paid for—in other words, increased expenditure in the ordinary sense of the term.

To see how this may be, we need to look a little closely into the leading features of the process of exchange.

When two countries have different currencies, it is obvious that a money payment cannot be made in one of the two directly by means of the coin of the other.

In the case, however, of coin being sent from the one country to the other for the purpose of making a payment it can be treated as bullion, and on its being sold in that character for as much as it will fetch in the currency of the country, the proceeds of sale can then be directly applied to making the payment.

The transaction would be essentially the same, whatever the saleable article employed as the medium of remittance; and for various reasons it is generally more convenient for the purpose of making a money payment in a foreign country to make use in the transaction of some other usual merchantable commodity rather than coin, or even bullion.

When the person who has occasion to make the payment himself purchases the commodity in his own country, sends it to the other and there procures it to be converted by sale into the money required, it is plain (speaking generally without taking account of the cost of transmission, etc.) that the rate of exchange, *i.e.*, the proportion between the amount of money expended in the one country to the amount of money of which that expenditure procures the command in the other, is identical with the proportion between the price per unit of measurement of the exported commodity in its home market, and the price per same unit of the same commodity in the foreign market.

To take an instance, suppose a quantity of tea is in this way made use of for the purpose of effecting a remittance from India to England, then it is plain that the number of rupees expended in the purchase of the tea in India bears the same proportion to the number of pounds realized by its sale in England as the price of the tea in rupees per case in India bears to the price of the tea in pounds per case in England.

Therefore, the fraction $\frac{\text{price (in pounds) in England}}{\text{price (in rupees) in India}}$ of £1 is the exchange, per rupee, at which this transaction of exchange was effected.

Commonly, no doubt, the person who makes an ordinary remittance does not himself undertake the work of exporting the necessary commodity for the purpose, but instead of doing so he, through the agency of a banker or broker, purchases from a trader in the shape of a bill of exchange the assignment of the sale proceeds in the foreign country of an exportation already made, or being made, by the trader in the way of business. The price at which he purchases the bill is of course matter of bargaining between the parties; but it may be assumed as an approximation to it that the trader will at least demand as much for the bill as will yield him the same profit, or thereabouts, as if his correspondent in the foreign country remitted to him the sale proceeds in question by purchasing with them a return commodity, and sending it to him for sale. And were that method adopted the rate of exchange would be given, as in the above case, by the proportion which the price of the imported commodity in its country of origin bears to the price which it realizes in the country to which it is imported—a proportion which, it can easily be shown, must be less than the proportion between the foreign and home prices of the exported commodity, if the trade transaction yields any profit.

In other words, to recapitulate the results of the argument, it may be said that in making a remittance of money from India to England by means of a bill of exchange, the money paid in India would generally bear approximately the same proportion to the money to be received in exchange in England, as the market price in India of an advantageous trade commodity sent in ordinary course of commerce from England to India bears to the market price of the same commodity in England; while in making the remittance by the direct export of a commodity selected for the purpose (which may be silver coin) the money paid by the remitter in India bears approximately the same proportion to the money to be received in England as the market price in India of an advantageous commodity sent specially from India to England for sale or conversion into money bears to the market price of the same commodity in England; and the proportion in the first case is greater than that in the second, which means that the rate of exchange is less.

It is not suggested that these formulas can be made use of to obtain numerical results of a practical kind; but if the considerations which have led to them are substantially sound in fact, they serve to show that the question as to the rate of exchange between India and England is not that inscrutable mysterious thing which the Secretary of State represents it to be, but in itself (to put the matter briefly) merely expresses a general relation between the silver prices of commodities in India and their gold prices in England.

From the foregoing we learn that a fall in exchange in making remittances from India to England may be due either to *increase in the general purchasing power of gold*, or *diminution in the general purchasing power of silver*, or a combination of both.

If it be assumed (as it commonly is by those who argue in favour of bimetallism) that the purchasing power of silver in India has not appreciably altered during the variation which has taken place in the rate of exchange, except, of course, as regards gold, then the fall in the rate must be due solely to increase in the purchasing power of gold; and although the number of sovereigns for which a given number of rupees will exchange is by this cause lessened, their purchasing power is increased in approximately the same proportion, and so the expenditure of rupees in India goes just as far as before in discharge of the indebtedness in England.

In fact, the silver prices of things, whether paid for immediately in silver or after a step of exchange in gold coin, must by the hypothesis remain unchanged.

But the indebtedness of India in England, which has to be discharged through the process of exchange, is in respect of commodities bought or services rendered from England on account of India. And, therefore, in the case supposed of a fall in exchange due solely to increase of the purchasing power of gold, if additional silver has to be paid in India in order to discharge the indebtedness in England, this is not really attributable to the alteration in the rate of exchange, but must mean one of two things, namely:

(i) Either that a corresponding additional quantity of commodities and services has been had—*i.e.*, that there has been additional material expenditure by India to the extent of the additional rupees;

(ii) Or that the gold prices of the commodities and services which India has had to pay for (or some of them) have for some cause gone up, notwithstanding the increase in the general purchasing power of gold.

These are possible alternatives, which the Secre-

tary of State's Explanatory Memorandum affords us no means of testing: but which should be the subjects of the closest and most searching enquiry on the part of those who are charged with the responsible duty of preparing the Budget Estimate for the year.

If on the other hand the fall in the rate of exchange is assumed to be due to a diminution of the general purchasing power of silver, in that case not only do the silver prices of things paid for in England through the operation of exchange in gold coin rise in amount, but the immediate silver prices of things in India must generally do so also in the same proportion—a consequence of serious import to the Government of India inasmuch as a large portion of the revenue is of a permanently fixed character.

LOOKING BACKWARDS.—I.

By A. O. Hume, C.B.

Our good friend and colleague, *The Champion*, of Bombay, in a recent article (on "Sir R. Temple's Reminiscences of the Indian Mutiny") with which I am generally in accord, introduces a remark which I fear may lead to serious misconceptions in a generation unborn when the troubles of 1857-58 supervened. He says, speaking of these:

> "It was never a mere military mutiny that shook the British dominion in India to its foundations and went nigh to overthrow it."

Now if he only means that the plot was not *absolutely* wholly a military one, and that there *were* non-military wire-pullers, he is unquestionably correct, but if he means, and this is what most readers will conclude, that the *people* of India took an appreciable part in originating the conspiracy, or even in aiding and abetting it when it had developed, he is, I believe, sadly misinformed.

I was in India seven years before the disturbances commenced, I was right through them, in the very vortex of the cyclone. I had always been on the most friendly and intimate terms with Indians of all ranks, and from the day the outbreak commenced at Meerut (for none of us understood the significance of the Barackpore mutiny) and for at least twenty-five years subsequently, I never lost a single opportunity of probing to the utmost limits possible, the sources of this terrible cataclysm. I have confidentially discussed the subject with simply thousands of the more intelligent elders, in the North-West Provinces, Oudh, the Punjab, Rajputana, the Central Provinces, and Central India—with Hindus and Mussulmans, princes, peasants, merchants, lawyers, traders, farmers, and I unhesitatingly affirm as the result of my own observations during the storm, and my long, patient, and widespread subsequent investigations, that on 999-1,000ths of the people of India, this burst quite as unexpectedly and quite as incomprehensibly as it did on the European community, and, further, that even when it was at its worst and when the masses fully believed that the sun of British rule had set never again to rise, not 1 per cent of those masses took any part in what has been called by some a rebellion, but was, in reality, mainly a widespread mutiny of mercenaries.

Of course, as this mutiny suspended all civil authority, numbers of criminals, both those at large at the moment and those released from our gaols by the mutineers, took advantage of this summary sheathing of the sword of justice to reap an easy harvest; but even of these the vast majority never really joined the soldiery, never actively operated against *us*, but contented themselves with plundering their weaker fellow-countrymen.

No doubt a number of the lower class Mussulmans, customs and revenue peons, burkandazes (policemen), butchers, weavers, and the like, a huge number, but certainly in the aggregate not amounting to two per cent. of the Mussulmans of India, believing that the rule of the King of Delhi was about to be re-established, made off to that old Mussulman capital, here and there committing excesses before starting, or *en route*.

No doubt some of the cattle-thieving tribes, Ahirs, Mewatees, Meenas, Meos, and the like, who had always given trouble under the emperors, again relapsed into their old evil ways; as also a portion, only a small portion, of the people of Oudh stuck to their hereditary chiefs, the Talooquedars, and fought against us.

No doubt here and there chiefs who had been, or conceived they had been, unjustly treated turned against us with their immediate following; but when all allowances, and these are many (too numerous to record in detail), are made, the fact remains that even at the worst time, before Delhi had fallen, not one per cent. of the population of India were hostile either to British rule or to Europeans.

Equally is it a fact that even in a place like Oudh the greatest of the Talooquedars had no forewarning of what was coming. Rájá Man Singh[1] deplored to me that it all came upon him like a bolt from the blue, so that he had been able to make no preparations, though, able man as he was, when it had come he seized the opportunity that offered and made the best of it. When Rájá Man Singh of Oudh had had no foreknowledge of the outbreak, all who knew the man and the position he held in the very heart of what, in those days, was, owing to the recent deposition of the Nawab, or King of Oudh, the greatest centre of disaffection in the whole empire, will at once realise what an absolutely infinitesimal fraction of the Indians can have had the slightest inkling of what was coming. As a matter of fact, all over Upper India estates were being bought, new houses built, new groves planted; large orders for goods had been sent down to Calcutta, thousands of boats loaded with grain, pulses, seeds, and cotton, were afloat on the Jumna

[1] I had a special connexion with Man Singh and the other Talooquedars. They had been most unjustly treated, and I had strongly advocated their cause in various papers; and when Sir C. Wingfield, who had been fighting for them as Chief Commissioner, was leaving India, he brought the two leaders, Rájá Man Singh and Tujummul Hoosein, and the secretary, Dukhinarangan Mookerjee, over to me at Etawah, and told them thenceforth to consult me in all their difficulties, which they did, until at last an equitable arrangement with Government was effected—equitable to all parties as I then thought, but as it has proved, owing to the working of the Act, giving them, I fear, rather more and the rayats rather less than was quite fair.

and Ganges, and everywhere marriages were being solemnised and arranged; forts had been allowed to go into disrepair, and not one single nobleman, that I could learn of, from Meerut to Allahabad, which includes the whole central stage of the struggle, had added a single man to his retainers or had the remotest idea that the poor old softly snoozing "Pax Britannica" was about to be so summarily ejected from her comfortable cot.

I have said that not one per cent of the population was even at the worst time hostile either to our rule or to Europeans, and some of the proofs of these points are these. As to the first, in the course of less than twelve months, we were able to enlist a quarter of a million troops, levies, police and guards, horse and foot, who all remained faithful during the great and prolonged crisis, and many of whom really fought like heroes. Now these men were drawn from the people, and had the people been even our passive ill-wishers, these men would not have risked their lives in what, when at least half of them enlisted, was believed to be a losing cause. As to the second, every European, who could escape into the country, get out, in fact, of the clutches of the soldiery, the criminals, the butchers and fanatical low-class Mussulmans of the towns, was saved. Everywhere the villagers sheltered them, hid them, fed them, and as soon as possible, piloted them, more or less disguised, through the stormy waves of the revolt to one of those rare island-like oases where England still had a foothold.

But it may be objected that a great deal of fighting went on all over the country, even in quite rural villages. This is quite true. In the first place, huge bands of dacoits, the late tenants of our innumerable broken jails, roamed the country openly attacking hamlets and even large villages. One leader, by name Alledad Khan Mewati, whom we afterwards disposed of satisfactorily, had under him a force of 2,000 men and four guns, and numbers of villages that he attacked fought him for days, and in many instances compelled him to sheer off, after no little loss. Again, all government being suspended old quarrels were resumed where they had been left off fifty odd years before, and, most fruitful source of all fighting and troubles, hundreds, nay thousands, of landholders who had lost their villages under our usury laws and civil court processes, attempted to regain possession of their ancestral acres, and though the new holders not unfrequently tried to fight the matter out with the help of men hired in the towns, the villagers usually sided with their old proprietors and the final result not unfrequently was the premature, but not lamented, decease of the usurer, too often a forger and cheat as well as a money-lender. Yes, there was a prodigious amount of fighting and village burning and all that, throughout the Doab especially, but that was not directed against us, nor did it lead to danger to Europeans. On the contrary, when a fugitive European arrived, where two villages were busily fusillading each other, the fight would be suspended, both sides would bring him food and drink and give him a cot to rest upon, and send him on his way with guides to the next important village—only resuming their engagement when he had passed quite out of range.

So far, therefore, as the entire population was concerned the outbreak was a mere military mutiny, and despite the individual chiefs, potentates, and nobles who had suffered more or less unjustly at our hands, and who in this outbreak deemed that an opportunity of redressing those wrongs had been sent by Heaven, joining actively against us, at no time was one per cent. of the population hostile, but even at the worst the immense mass of the people were actively or passively on our side, and friendly both to our rule and ourselves individually.

It is well that this should be clearly realised, well that England should remember the immeasurable debt of gratitude that she owes to India's millions, who stood by her in those days of danger and distress —danger and distress due entirely to her own unwisdom, and alas, injustice as well.

LAND REVENUE ASSESSMENT IN MADRAS.

By Alexander Rogers.
Late of the Bombay Civil Service.

With reference to the answers, relating to the Land Revenue Administration of the Madras Presidency, given to Sir W. Wedderburn in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for India on the 19th instant, it may be interesting to your readers to learn a few details, to enable them to understand more fully the causes that have led to the present state of affairs.

In a rayatvári settlement, that is to say, one in which the State contracts for the payment of land revenue directly with individual cultivators in place of heads of villages, it is necessary to assess the lands field by field, as each tenant holds on an average only four or five acres. After an accurate measurement of such fields, the quality of the soil of each must be ascertained by the classification of that soil, and according to that quality a money assessment has to be imposed on the field as the rent to be paid to the State.

I wish to describe the processes under which these two indispensable operations are carried out in Madras according to the instructions laid down in the authorised Manual.

Land is supposed to come under one or other of five orders: these are (1) the regar or black cotton soil; (2) the red ferruginous; (3) the arenaceous; (4) the alluvial and permanently improved; and (5) the calcareous. Each order is divided into classes, the exceptional into two, the others into three each. The class of a soil is determined by the quantity of clay it contains, meaning by clay that impalpable matter which is formed by the combination of minute particles of the primitive earths with organic matter in a state of decay (N.B.—This description is quoted word for word from the Manual). The three soil classes are "clay," "loam," and "sand." Clay soils of each series (order) are those containing more than 66 per cent. of clay; loamy soils are those with one-third to two-thirds clay and the rest sand; sandy soils those with more than two-thirds sand. In selecting samples the soil is turned up to a depth of six or eight inches, and the proportions of

sand and clay, where doubtful, are tested by dissolution in water. The classes again are subdivided into sorts, the sort being determined on the same consideration as the class. From the first, Government has deprecated any attempt at making an accurately scientific classification of soils. The classes adopted are few and based on tangible differences of soil; for the most part eye, finger, and thumb, are the classifier's only guides, and the nearest approach to a scientific method that is allowed him is when in cases of doubt he tests for clay by simple methods which give its bulk or weight, but do not indicate its chemical composition.

Now, is this method of classification simple, practical, and trustworthy? Letting alone the absurdity that lowly-paid native classifiers (or any classifiers, for that matter) can be trusted to go through thousands of fields to ascertain, either by manipulation or dissolution in water, whether a lump of soil contains under 33, over 33, or over 66 per cent. of so-called clay, a fact which could not be ascertained without weighing the sample of earth, evaporating the water, and weighing the residue, the method is chemically wrong, for the phosphates and nitrates which give a soil its fertility, as well as the salts that diminish it, are soluble in water, and would, therefore, disappear from the calculation.

The system, moreover, is, as far as the instructions for classification go, extremely faulty in not taking into account other deteriorating influences that take from the value, such as want of depth (a most important consideration in a rocky country), sloping surface that allows water in the rains to wash away the soil, impregnation with salt, too great an admixture of gravel, etc.

Even the orders of soil are imperfectly defined. There is no such thing as "permanently improved," as the Madras manual lays down in No. 4, for the effect of no manure lasts for ever. If the definition is meant to apply to land turned from unirrigated to irrigated, or embanked or improved in that kind of way, that is no reason why it should be reckoned a natural order of soil.

But suppose all these processes completed, is it right to describe them as simple and practical? A field in its soil must belong to one of three classes (clay, loam, or sand) of one of five orders (regar, ferruginous, arenaceous, alluvial and permanently improved, and calcareous): that is to say, there are fifteen different categories to which any soil may belong, and a poorly-paid classifier on, perhaps, 10 to 20 rupees a month has to decide to which. Add to this that his so-called water test in a test-tube or similar vessel is not carried out by weighing the residue, and may vary for every part of a field tested without a chance of detection by his supervising officer, and as wide a door for bribery is opened as most lowly-paid classifiers need generally desire.

In this system lies the original cause of failure of equitable assessment, that is, proportional to the intrinsic qualities of the soil, in Madras. There is no standard with which those qualities can be compared, and all is, therefore, haphazard and uneven.

The answers given by Lord George Hamilton referred to above are conspicuously lacking in candour. I hereby challenge him publicly to disprove any one of the figures given in Sir W. Wedderburn's questions further than two little slips which may be accounted for by printers' errors, for they were all taken from the Madras Revenue reports. When he said that the Madras Government hoped to report shortly, he did not tell the House, as he should have if he wished to state the real facts of the case, that the matter has been before them already over three years. Again, in quoting the number of evictions for 1883 and 1890 he burked the fact that those for 1891-2 were 11,118, for 1892-3 12,400 and for 1893-4 14,198.

I proceed now to the system of assessment itself. The most superficial observer passing over a few acres of standing crops in any part of the world cannot fail to see the great differences there are in these crops even in adjoining fields, notwithstanding the apparently identical geological and climatic circumstances. Anyone walking over the same ground when bare of crops would see at a glance sufficient to account for such differences in the marks of runlets of water caused by the natural flow of the drainage and variety in colour of soil, which would be accentuated if he examined its texture on the surface, or digging a little deeper (say eighteen inches, the least depth to which fertile soil should go), found a substratum, more or less near to that surface, of stone, or impervious clay, or sand, or other unfertile substance. If in a space of a few acres there are such differences to be seen, those to be found in thousands of square miles of country, in which geological and climatic circumstances must vary immensely, must be altogether beyond calculation. Notwithstanding this, the Madras system of assessment is to this day based on the supposed average produce of soils, complicated, after deduction of from one-fourth to one-sixth to allow for vicissitudes of seasons, by conversion of that produce into money at an average of prices of the principle varieties of grain for a period of twenty years, and, by deduction from the money value thus arrived at, of the average expense of cultivation per acre, such as the cost of agricultural cattle and of their keep, seed, hire of labour (permanent and temporary), implements, manure and transplanting. Some of these items, such as the cost of cattle and farm tools, have even to be subdivided and spread over more than one year.

The figures of these elaborate processes of calculation must be a curiosity, and their mere enumeration, carried out, as they are, over experiments on crops to the number of 2,000 or 3,000 in a single district, is sufficient to convince anyone not under the influence of the magic of figures of the impracticable nature of the system of thus assessing the proper rents of individual fields, which are taken at one-half the residue, called the net produce, after the deductions noted above.

Each field has in the meanwhile been classed under one of the fifteen categories of soil already mentioned. Each field having thus been ascertained to be of a certain sort geologically and agriculturally (what the latter term means it is difficult to understand), and the amount of the money value of the net produce of that sort having been fixed in the manner described above, it is said that the tenant

knows how much he will have to pay, that is, 50 per cent. of the money value of the net produce fixed for his particular sort. If such is the case, he and the classer will not be long in coming to terms as to the nature of the entry to be made against his field, and the slight chance of detection when one that ought to be (say) "Regar—clay—1st sort," is recorded as "3rd sort—sand," when the imperfect water test already described is supposed to have been applied, will be run.

A consideration of the distance of the field from the village site and water, an element that, in the people's eyes, greatly affects the value of a field, appears to be omitted altogether from the calculation. Again, no one but the settling officer should know till the last moment how the whole of a village will be affected as regards its rates of assessment by its proximity to or distance from markets for the sale of produce, or by the greater or less certainty of the rainfall in consequence of the vicinity of hills or forests. If some rayats have the chance, it is not in their nature not to attempt to bribe in order to get his rent lowered, and the system described gives him the chance with little fear of detection, for, as pointed out above, the water test, even if honestly carried out, is entirely fallacious.

I do not speak without book in denouncing this system of assessment, as I have been doing officially to the India Office authorities for over three years, for it was tried in Bombay and condemned about fifty years ago. Notwithstanding this, Madras has persevered in it, with the result that there are still about 3½ millions of acres of assessed land lying waste and unprofitable to the State, tenants by the thousand are evicted every year in order to realise the land revenue, and when their property is put up to auction the greater portion has to be bought in by Government for want of bidders, what is sold fetching at the forced sales about one fourth of its estimated value.

Is it not time that some decided steps should be taken to put a stop to this disastrous state of affairs, when cotton duties have to be imposed in order to make the Indian budget balance? Madras men have said to me that the people evicted are speculators who take up land without any intention of holding it beyond a year or two, whilst the strength it has acquired through lying fallow may last. If such were the case, why should they not give it up of their own accord instead of having to be evicted, and why should they expose themselves to the risk of their property being seized and sold for a quarter of its estimated value? If the land were equitably assessed, with a margin for landlord's profits, would they not continue to hold it and let it lie fallow when it required to be so left? The truth of the case is that the land is rack-rented under the system described, and it is not worth the tenants' while to hold it. The whole system requires to be abolished, and one more profitable both to the State and its tenants, as it exists in Bombay, adopted.

[Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., as will be seen from "Our London Letter," has asked for a full Re[illegible]victions, etc., in the Madras Presidency for each of the years 1883-4 to 1893-4.—Ed. India.]

THE ABOLITION OF TRIAL BY JURY.

By A. Nundy.

The Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill is still pending before the Legislative Council of India, and, though there are good reasons for anticipating that the obnoxious clause interfering with the so-called finality of verdicts given by juries in certain cases will be withdrawn, no announcement to that effect has yet been made by the Government of India, and the probability is that in some modified form an attempt will be made by the Legal Member to get it passed by the Legislature. Sir Alexander Miller, in his latest utterance before the Council, stated that if in Committee the retention of this section were objected to, he would move its rejection. But the ways of the Government of India are devious, and it can never be confidently predicted what will happen. Besides, it is desirable that English readers should be apprised of the utter disregard shown by the Government of India for the rights and the feelings of the people, in its attempt practically to deprive them of the privilege of trial by jury, such as it is at present. For, strictly speaking, this privilege as understood in Europe is rigidly confined to cases tried by the High Courts of India in the exercise of their original criminal jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is exercised with reference to all offences of a serious nature occurring in the Presidency towns (Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay), and with reference to offences committed by European British subjects outside the Presidency towns. So far as Indians outside the Presidency towns are concerned, the privilege of trial by jury is subject to the following limitations and disabilities:—

(*a*) In the North-Western Provinces, Punjab, Central Provinces, and some of the minor dependencies, a trial by jury is not permitted at all.

(*b*) In the Bengal, Bombay, and Madras Presidencies it is permitted only in certain districts, and as regards certain offences specially notified by the local government.

(*c*) The verdict given by juries is not final, for if the sessions judge disagree with it, he may, under sec. 307 of the Criminal Procedure Code, "submit the case to the High Court, recording the grounds of his opinion, and when the verdict is one of acquittal, stating the offence which he considers to have been committed." The High Court in dealing with the case "may acquit or convict the accused of any offence of which the jury could have convicted him, . . . and if it convicts him may pass such sentence as might have been passed by the court of session.

Such are the great privileges which constitute an offence to some English officials. Whereas the Congress on the one hand is agitating for the extension of trial by jury, the Government on the other hand is seeking to add to the restrictions and limitations under which it exists in certain parts, and practically to render it nugatory and inoperative. In Bengal, Sir Charles Elliott, at a stroke, deprived the people of this privilege, in the year 1892, but his jury notifi-

cation, raised such a storm of indignation and remonstrance, that the Government of India had to appoint a special commission and in deference to the views of this commission, the late Lieut.-Governor of Bengal withdrew his notification. The Government of India is now attempting to curtail the existing privileges of the people, restricted as they are.

What are the reasons which have induced the Government of India to take this step? Ostensibly the object is to provide against perverse verdicts which, it is alleged, are given by juries in certain cases—in other words, to provide against verdicts which do not commend themselves to the executive authorities. To deal with perverse verdicts the existing provisions of the law are ample and adequate, for the High Courts acting under section 307 have always reversed such verdicts. But it is in reality the construction put on this section by the High Courts which has led the Government to seek a modification of the existing law. The executive authorities are of opinion that the High Courts put a very narrow construction on that section, and thus abstain from interfering with the verdict of a jury, when in the exercise of their legal powers they would have done well to set it aside. The Government would have been pleased if the High Courts, after reviewing the whole of the evidence, had confirmed the verdict of the jury if they agreed with it, or set it aside if they disagreed with it. But the judges of the High Court act on quite another principle: they have uniformly held that they will not set aside the verdict of a jury merely because they do not agree with it, but only in such cases as they find it to be clearly and manifestly wrong and perverse.

To tie the hands of the High Court, it is proposed to amend Sec. 303 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which is as follows:—

"The jury shall return a verdict on all the charges on which the accused is tried, and the judge may ask them such questions as are necessary to ascertain what their verdict is."

In other words, the jury is to bring in a verdict of guilty or not guilty, but if there be any ambiguity in their verdict the judge may try to clear it by further questions; otherwise he must accept it. For this section it is now proposed to substitute the following provisions:—

(*a*) The judge may require the jury to return a special verdict consisting of separate findings on any particular questions of fact which he may desire, and *he* shall thereupon determine whether, in accordance with such findings, the accused is to be recorded as having been convicted or acquitted by the jury.

(*b*) After a general verdict has been returned, if the judge is in doubt whether it is one with which he should or should not express agreement, he may require the jury further to return a special verdict on any question or questions of fact on which he may desire their opinion, and shall, after the receipt of such special verdict, finally determine whether to agree or disagree with the verdict of the jury.

(*c*) After a special verdict has been returned under the above clauses, if the judge requires any further information on any questions of fact, he may require the jury to return a further special verdict as to such questions of fact, and shall then finally determine whether a verdict of acquittal or of conviction is to be recorded.

(*d*) In any of the foregoing cases, if the judge is in doubt as to the meaning of the verdict returned, he may ask such questions as may be necessary to ascertain what the verdict is.

Such is the purport of the provisions sought to be introduced by the new Bill. It is no exaggeration to say that in the hands of a clever judge a jury might, under these provisions, be induced to bring in any verdict which the judge might wish.

But is there any foundation for the allegation that Indian juries are in the habit of returning perverse verdicts? Taking Bengal as an instance we find, by reference to the report of the High Court on the Criminal Administration of that Province, that in the year 1894 the number of persons tried by jury was 464, and their verdict in respect to 407 persons was approved by the sessions judge, and disapproved in respect of 57, *i.e.*, as regards 12 per cent. of the cases. Acting under Sec. 307 of the Criminal Procedure Code, the sessions judge made a reference to the High Court as regards 39 persons. Of the cases so referred, 28 were heard and decided by the High Court, and in 11 cases the verdict of the jury was upheld, but in 17 cases it was reversed. Thus we find that the number of cases in which the High Court, disagreeing with the jury, set aside their verdict was 2·5 per cent. of the total number of cases decided by the jury, or, taking into account the cases not reported by the sessions judges but with the verdict in which he disagreed, we find that the High Court could not possibly have set aside more than 4·5 per cent. of the total number of cases. But if we look at the statistics for the last ten years relating to the decisions of sessions judges with the aid of assessors, it will be found that on an average 28 per cent. of these cases were reversed.

It is a peculiar fact that where public opinion is unanimous in condemning certain existing abuses, the Government of India is slow in moving to correct these abuses; but it is eager to bring about changes in respect of matters about which there has been no complaint. The people of India are praying for the separation of the executive and judicial functions exercised by certain magistrates, and the Government, though convinced of the reasonableness of the prayer, turns a deaf ear to it. Yet whereas there is a consensus of opinion as to the satisfactory results of trial by jury, the Government is anxious practically to do away with it. Even assuming that it has been a failure, it is the people who suffer by it. How comes it, then, that they do not complain? Journals of all shades and representing all communities have united in protesting against the proposed modification in the law as being reactionary and uncalled for. Indignation meetings have been held in different parts of the country, unreservedly condemning the Government for attempting to interfere with the long established rights of the people. If trial by jury is a failure, then some explanation ought to be forthcoming why those who are its victims should display such a unanimity in upholding it. In the statement of objects and reasons for bringing in the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill the Government says:—

"The object of the Bill is to give effect to such of the recommendations made by the Jury Commission of 1894 as have been approved by the Government of India and Her Majesty's Secretary of State;"

but it is a curious fact that the Jury Commission did not approve of any amendments which had for their

object the obtaining of a special verdict. They say:

"We are not in favour of any alteration in the present law, which provides sufficient means for obtaining a verdict, and we think that there are strong objections to anything of the nature of a cross-examination of the jurors as to details of a case so as to obtain their opinions on portions of the evidence. . . . . We have considered anxiously whether it is practicable to enable the judge to direct the jury to return a special verdict on issues. This proposal is supported by high authority, and we are fully sensible of the advantage it would be to the High Court in referred cases to have a special instead of general verdict to deal with, but we have reluctantly come to the conclusion that such a procedure would be liable to create greater evils than it would remedy."

This is the opinion of a Commission presided over by a judge of the High Court who, as a civilian, had filled for a number of years the office of Sessions Judge. Two of the members of the Commission were respectively an ex-judge of the High Court, who had acted as Chief Justice of Bengal, and Sir Griffith Evans, one of the leading barristers of the Calcutta High Court, who is a *persona grata* with the Government of India, having been for a number of years successively nominated to a seat in the Legislative Council.

The Government of India is undoubtedly in a peculiar predicament. Its views have been repudiated by the Commission appointed by itself, and the judges of the High Court are no more inclined to give it their support. The Bengal High Court judges

"do not recommend any change in the law, believing as they do that such a change would be followed by practical difficulties of an embarrassing and far-reaching nature."

The Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court records a minute in which the other judges concur to the following effect:

"As to the proposed amendment to empower the sessions judges to require a special verdict on particular issues of fact, there is no reason why it should be exercised in one case rather than in another, and the result will be that jurors will virtually be called upon to give their reasons, and would thus differ but little, if at all, from assessors. I agree with the Commission that such a procedure will be liable to create greater evils than it would remedy."

And, alas for the Government! even the sessions judges are not unanimous in expressing a desire for an amendment, for some of them have written strongly to deprecate any modification of the existing law. Under these circumstances it would be matter for no surprise if Sir Alexander Miller were finally to withdraw the obnoxious clause from the Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill now pending before the Council. He would do well to take that course. But why, in the name of common sense, was the clause inserted?

ENGLISH IGNORANCE OF INDIA.

By an Independent Politician.

India is a veiled secret, a mere metaphysical problem to most Englishmen. Startling events push aside the veil and transform the metaphysical into the real, with an immense, healthy, if momentary, shock to our common sense. Famine or riot, a frontier war, or a deficit in the revenue, comes along, and for a time we are all amazed at our own ignorance. At first this ignorance seems criminal, because it convicts us of negligence and stupidity, and then we begin to excuse ourselves because India is so far away, so vast, so miraculous a problem, and we fly to the so-called experts, who are delighted to cram us with what they know, to lull us into confidence in their ability, and to assure us that we had better attend to our own affairs. How can we know anything of India if we have never lived there, if we have never fought there, if we have never had a share in ruling her? Then we are treated to dogmatic utterances which we are told we ought to accept, unquestioned, on pain of being regarded as irrational; and probably we doze off again into a sweet sense of the necessary finiteness of our own knowledge and the value of official assertions.

The fact is that we are discouraged in our investigations, if not bewildered, by the greatness of many Indian problems. Few politicians of an independent turn of mind have not been brow-beaten and silenced in this fashion. If a man wishes to take a clear common sense view for himself, he is regarded as something of a fanatic. A common sense view of Indian questions, indeed! Why the experts, as they call themselves, are up in arms at once against such a revolutionary tendency. It must not be permitted. The secrets of India must be kept, as a rule, from the profane eyes of the vulgar multitude. It is a place to which we send governors, civil servants, soldiers, and missionaries, with an occasional wide-awake traveller who is always jumped upon for his mistakes, if he makes any, and for rudeness if he ventures to call a spade a spade. When officials return we can question them, in a submissive frame of mind, and difference from them is held to be an obvious absurdity, so that we remain in a curious kind of comatose ignorance, and the men who govern dumb millions in India expect to meet with persons as intellectually submissive in England. The exercise of common sense is denied to us. It has been my experience on many occasions. It has been the experience of hundreds of others. We want a common sense view, and we cannot get it. What we are always invited to accept is official expert opinion, wrapped up for us in pretty paper, as if it were a packet of cigarettes.

I shall be told that this is an exaggeration. My answer is that English opinions are always blunted, English investigations discouraged, English criticisms pushed aside by this amazing superiority of the experts. We are asked to be as docile as the Hindus, to be as ready to applaud; and when we cannot applaud, because we do not understand, to be thankful that, in our ignorance, there are wise men at hand who can give us their knowledge freely. I say that this is a danger and a discredit to us, and a danger and a discredit to India. At home it leads to mental sloth, indifference, readiness to accept any silly excuse for expenditure or a reckless policy. It makes the experts a caste. It shifts from the masses of the English people all quick sense of responsibility. It destroys touch with enlightened civil opinion in India, whenever and wherever it is known to exist. It smothers it up so

that we find ourselves wondering whether it ever exists at all. To most English politicians, in fact, there is no such thing as Indian opinion, or there ought not to be, outside of the governing or the military class. I defy any one to call this a common sense view. But I ought to say that a curious admission is often made the better to beguile us into complacency. Bazaar opinion is scornfully referred to as if it were the only kind of opinion to be got at—a wild, reckless, infantile kind of prattle that is to be always ignored. Contrast this with official enlightenment, calm, benignant, opulent, and then judge for yourselves, is the advice given.

The danger of this state of things is real. If common-sense English opinion does not make itself heard and felt, is not cultivated and strengthened, common-sense Indian opinion, of the best kind, will not be respected either. Just now it is the fashion in India to laugh at Lancashire opinion because it is interested, selfish, mercenary. But the general opinion of England which finds expression, if I may so describe it, in dumb acquiescence in independent finance, is a great power. Were it as strong on other questions, were it as sure on frontier questions, were it as clear on Indian political and social questions, what a power it would be! It can only become real by a common-sense study of Indian questions, by something like a revolt against the refined despotism of officialism and expertism, and by a free discussion of whatever happens in our Indian Empire as concerning our morality, our political position in the world, our possible future. In a word, if we want to develop true enlightened common-sense opinion in India, we must begin by resolving to set the example of emancipation from the thralls of our official personages at home.

The theory of our government in India requires the exercise of intellectual manhood. The old theory, now getting ragged and rent, was that we ruled India in the interests of England, as conqueror and suzerain. I find that we are getting a bit ashamed of this theory, but we flaunt it in our Jingo moods. It underlies every chapter in the development of our frontier policy. But if this be so, we must intelligently understand our own interests, and the more we apply our common sense criticisms the better. The expert answer always is: "Yes; but you must let us interpret British interests for you, and what we say is gospel." Ah! I reply, the gospel of a scientific Afghan frontier nineteen years ago, now banned and rotten; the gospel of a Chitral annexation to-day." This is what I call a common sense view. The newer theory of our rule is that we govern in the interests of India, and hence some show of deference must be paid to Indian opinion and interests. I write "show" with meaning, for it is only a show. It assumes the same amazing ignorance in India, the same mild-eyed meekness that has been, until quite recently, habitual in England. But my contention is that if you change the theory you must alter the method. Interpretation must not still be official and expert when native interests are pleaded, put in, exalted, and recognised. Some plan must be devised—it is not my province to suggest it—for the better development and ascertainment, the quicker recognition of what the best Indians think and feel upon questions vital to their financial, political, and social well being.

The security for this efficiency is only to be found in the removal of the dense ignorance of Englishmen. There is no other way of getting rid of the dominance of what is often narrow, prejudiced, but still considered expert opinion. Personally, I have constantly striven to get at the bottom of many Indian problems in an independent way, and when I have come across any pert official, I have managed to hold my own, and sometimes events have proved my case. I want my countrymen to bestir themselves in view of their responsibilities, and to pay more attention to the frontier, financial, and internal questions of the Indian Empire. Parliament will then be influenced for good. India will feel the effect of this new spirit, official opinion will become less dogmatic. The old theory of rule and the new will be blended into some clearer system. The English conscience will quicken the Indian conscience, and be sharpened by it in turn. The great secret will be unveiled, the problem will become a real one, the future will be clearer and more luminous.

"ALL MEMBERS FOR INDIA"!

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

The agitation on the question of the cotton duties has entered upon another phase. Public meetings, attended by both Hindus and Muhammadans with a sprinkling of Europeans, have been held in different cities in India, and have passed resolutions to boycott all imported cloth, and have pledged themselves to wear only the produce of Indian looms. The Sarvajanik Sabha of Poona, perhaps the most influential political association in India, has solemnly resolved to desist from the use of English-made stuffs. The vernacular press is preaching a similar crusade, and is supported by some of the English papers. A quotation from each will suffice. Says the *Mahratta*, published in Poona:—

"Take an oath, a holy oath, by the love you bear to India, by the noble memory of your heroic Aryan ancestors, that as long as Great Britain does not wipe off the disgraceful spot of dark injustice that disfigures her name, that as long as India is made the shuttlecock of party politics in England, that as long as the people of this country are not treated as men who have every right to all that an Englishman delights in as subjects of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, India will have nothing to do with cloth which has been produced and stained by selfishness. Resolve rather to die than touch one inch of Manchester cloth. There is energy enough in the country to supply the wants of its people. Use Indian cloth and Indian cloth alone. Let every one who buys one yard of British cloth be branded a traitor to his country—to be shunned as a veritable monster. Beloved countrymen, rise up in a manner worthy of our just cause, convince a Christian people, how Indians can nobly suffer with more than Christian fortitude, emulate the patriotic Irish and the heroic American, declare a war to the death with the commerce of Lancashire."

And the *Indian Mirror* (Calcutta) writes:

"Let it be shown from one end of the country to the other that we are not quietly going to accept legislation of this sort, and that we mean to continue our protests against it till our wrongs are righted and our grievances remedied. And if we cannot successfully appeal to the conscience of either the Government of India or the Secretary of State, or even Parlia-

ment, the remedy in this one matter at least lies in our own hands. Then the watchwords of this country shall be: 'Boycott Lancashire, and have Swadeshi goods for ever!'"

A correspondent of the same journal closes a long letter as follows:

"Does England propose to drive India to despair in the same way? (referring to America and Ireland). Let her beware! God forbid that she should ever bungle and blunder in the same way here. For in Ireland she has to deal with a few millions only, whereas here she has got to deal with hundreds of millions. It is the pinching poverty of the people that so terribly convulsed France, and led the French people to resort to most awful acts of violence at about this time last century; and history repeats itself. He is a wise ruler who takes lesson from the history of the past."

After exhorting England to behave justly and generously, the writer proceeds:

"But should England refuse to behave properly we Indians have a solemn duty to perform. We must in that case stand shoulder to shoulder, we must unite as one man, and boycott everything English. We must shake off our sheepish docility, and so act as would have done honour to old Rome when Rome did honour to mankind. Let Manchester and Lancashire take heed in time, or there will be war to the knife between them and ourselves. We either ruin them or we ruin ourselves—we must either do or die."

This is the first time in the history of the British empire in India that the people have evinced a disposition to resent the action of the Indian Government by entering into a combination which, if persisted in, is calculated to produce serious consequences. It will reduce the revenue derived from the import duty on cotton goods, it will inflict great injury upon British trade, but above all it will embitter the feelings of the Indian and the English people towards each other. I feel sure that neither Lancashire nor the British Government ever anticipated that they were raising such a storm or they would have paused before they adopted a line of conduct which ignores the obligation due by a Government to its subjects, and shows a total insensibility to the feelings of the people. English officials profess to be as omniscient as they say they are beneficent in their actions. Whilst on the one hand they entertain a profound conviction that their actions are actuated by the kindest motives, on the other hand they are equally certain that they are fully and correctly informed of the sentiments the people harbour towards them. I emphatically deny the truth of either assertion. The Government of India may flatter itself that its actions are always as just as they are benevolent, but a great many intelligent and well-disposed persons are of opinion that of late it has shown an utter disregard for fair and righteous dealing, and a callous indifference to the feelings of the people. Perhaps the deep resentment it has at last succeeded in rousing will create an unpleasant surprise in the official mind and disabuse it as to its ability to gauge the sentiments of the people.

But this is not an unexpected ebullition of feeling that we are now witnessing. Recent events had rendered it probable that sooner or later these pent-up feelings would burst forth. The demeanour of a certain class of Europeans and a great many officials has irritated and alienated the respectable classes of Indians, the charges of assault and murder against Englishmen which unfortunately of late have been pretty frequent, and the immunity from punishment which is the recognised fate of the offender, have roused bitter feelings in the minds of the people, the utter disregard for the wishes and the privileges of the people shown by attempts at legislation such as that on the jury question has swept away the prevailing notions of justice and fair-mindedness of the rulers, whilst the barefaced manner in which the interests of India have been subordinated to the selfish demands of Lancashire has excited bitter indignation, and a desire for some retaliation at all cost. That the people are loyal I do not for a moment doubt, but at the same time of late their loyalty has received too many rude shocks, and they are anything but contented with their position. For some time past there have been indications that they were not disposed to bear an injustice done to them without uttering a remonstrance, and now finding no heed paid to their remonstrance in a matter in which they were being gratuitously wronged, they are concerting plans of retaliation, with which the Government itself can find no fault, while no unprejudiced person could deny that they have good and substantial reasons for their proposed action. What makes the matter more iniquitous is that the Secretary of State for India has committed a distinct breach of faith with reference to the recent modification of the cotton duties. He had given a promise not to take further action till he had heard the Indian side of the question. But without waiting for the representations made by the mill-owners and Chambers of Commerce in India, he passed his final orders, thus showing an utter contempt for the people who are the victims of his indecent haste. For what is the result of his action? Whilst it grants a fairly large measure of relief to Lancashire, it needlessly handicaps the Indian mill industry, and the poorest of India's countless millions are taxed to the extent of fifty lakhs of rupees a year. And this simply to catch a few votes from Lancashire. So be it. But Lord George Hamilton must not complain if the people combine together and spoil his little plan.

COMMENTING in the April number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* upon Lord George Hamilton's answers to questions with reference to the invasion of Kafiristan, Dr. G. W. Leitner writes:—The answers show what little attention has been really paid to the questions put on both sides of the House. Even as late as the 3rd March, Lord G. Hamilton practically repeated the assurances of the 23rd February which had the effect of lulling the friends of the Kafirs in the Press and Parliament into a false security. Yet he had no real authority to contradict the announcement, published in the Indian papers, of the Afghan Commander-in-Chief that the campaign would be renewed with increased vigour in the first days of March. As a matter of fact, the slaughter began in the South and West of Kafiristan, the East having already been depopulated and over 16,000 of the survivors having already been carried thence into village slavery. If Lord Elgin had no better information than that with which he misled Lord G. Hamilton and caused him to mislead the House, the sooner he is recalled the better. However on the 6th March he *did* telegraph to England about the severe fighting and loss in the Ramgul Valley, and if Lord G. Hamilton then knew of it he ought at once to have communicated it to the House, and not waited till one of his supporters extracted the information from him on the 23rd. Nothing seems to have been done to stop the slaughter and enslavement of the Kafirs, and nothing, we fear, will be done.

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE.

SPEECH BY MR. MANOMOHAN GHOSE.

We take the following extracts from the valuable speech delivered by Mr. Manomohan Ghose at the Poona Congress last December in support of the resolution praying for the separation of Judicial and Executive functions in India:

The Subjects Committee of this Congress having decided that I should move the fourth resolution, regarding the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice, I feel bound to carry out that direction. At the same time, I must confess that I cannot congratulate them on the wisdom of their choice in selecting me for this purpose. I have written and said so much on the subject of late years that I feel that, from one point of view, I am disqualified from discharging the duty satisfactorily, as I cannot say anything new. I am glad, however, that the principle which underlies the resolution is one regarding which there is not, and never has been, any serious difference of opinion.

A Sound Principle.

From the days of Lord Cornwallis down to the present time English administrators have repeatedly acknowledged the soundness of the principle for which we are contending. It is now exactly 100 years since the Government of Lord Cornwallis, in the preamble to a regulation of the Governor-General, publicly recorded that, in the opinion of the Government of India, it was exceedingly desirable that revenue officers and others performing Executive duties should not be called upon to try cases in which they have themselves been mixed up. The reform, however, was not then carried out, but in 1861, a few years after the Mutiny, when the Police Act was under discussion before the Legislative Council of the Governor-General of India, strenuous efforts were made by distinguished English officials to bring about this reform. It was on that occasion that no less eminent a member of the Civil Service than Sir Bartle Frere declared that the reform was one which must be carried out sooner or later, and that the only difficulties in the way were "prejudices of long standing." At that time Mr. Sconce, another distinguished member of the Civil Service and a judge of the Sudder Court, insisted upon the reform being then carried out, but he was put off with the assurance that in a very few years the measure which he advocated would be carried out.

"Our Cries Remain Unheeded."

At that time the National Congress was not even heard of, and I mention this fact in order to show that this is a reform which has all along been advocated by English officials and administrators themselves, and not by so-called revolutionaries like ourselves. Nothing, however, was done, and although since the establishment of this Congress we have repeatedly agitated for this small measure of reform, our cries have yet remained unheeded. As the President has told us only the other day, both Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross stated from their places in Parliament that it was exceedingly desirable that this reform should be carried out without further loss of time; but the difficulty which then pressed Lord Kimberley was, as he put it, solely based upon financial considerations. I regret to say that it is impossible for me or anyone who has studied the subject to accept this as a satisfactory explanation of the delay which has taken place in carrying out this reform. . . . . It seems unreasonable that we should be put off on the ground of financial embarrassment, when there is a yearly surplus which ought undoubtedly to be devoted to improving the very administration which yields that surplus. (Applause.) But, after all, that is not the real objection.

The Bugbear of "Prestige."

It is time that the responsible heads of the Government and the public at large should know and realise what the real objection of our opponents is. Not long ago a distinguished Indian civilian belonging to this Presidency—I think I ought to mention his name, because he made no secret of it, Mr. James, Commissioner in Sindh—wrote an article in an English magazine, in which he described the present system which combines Judicial and Executive functions in one officer as "the mainstay of British power in India." (Shame.) The real objection then is the apprehension on the part of the Executive officers that their prestige will suffer if the reform we advocate is carried out. I cannot help thinking that the vice of our present administration is that justice is too often sacrificed at the altar of that bugbear known as prestige. (Hear, hear.) I have always understood that the real "mainstay of British power in India" was not in a system which tended to pervert justice, but in the belief that English courts dispensed even-handed justice. I am sure I express the opinion of everyone present here when I say that that is the true "mainstay of British power in India," and anything which tends to impair that confidence in the minds of the people strikes at the root of what is the true "mainstay of British power." (Cheers.) Not long ago I had occasion to point out to the present Secretary of State for India, who did me the honour of granting me an interview in London, that the general feeling among my countrymen was that justice was unattainable when the prestige of any public officer was involved. In saying so I believe I expressed the universal feeling of my countrymen on the subject. (Cheers.) I told him that the belief among the people of India was gaining ground that from the police constable drawing seven rupees a month up to Her Majesty's Secretary of State it was one continued ladder of prestige; that each officer was anxious to support the prestige of his own immediate subordinate even at the sacrifice of justice. Lord George Hamilton, who, I believe, is anxious to govern this country justly and with sympathy, no doubt realised the gravity of the observation; but he remarked that to a certain extent in the case of a service animated by an *esprit de corps* this state of things was almost unavoidable. When speaking in London on the subject I was cautious enough to speak of the feeling among my countrymen without expressing any opinion as to whether that feeling was well founded or not; but by a strange fatality I now find that just about the time I was speaking to Her Majesty's Secretary of State, Sir Charles Elliott was making a speech in Calcutta admitting and justifying the truth of my observation. He said, on the occasion of a public dinner, that the Government in India was always anxious not "to wash their dirty linen in public," and that it was absolutely necessary to maintain the prestige of a public servant publicly even if he had misconducted himself. (Shame.) This convinces me that I had accurately represented to the Secretary of State not only the true state of feeling among my countrymen, but that in reality the feeling was well founded. Well, it is that bugbear of prestige which, as Sir Richard Garth has pointed out, is in our way in this matter, and financial considerations are merely put forward because our opponents have not the courage to avow what the real objection is.

The "Connecting Link."

Not long ago a high Bengal official, whose name I am not entitled to divulge, because his communication was confidential, wrote to the Government of India to say that in his opinion it was undesirable to divest the magistrate of the district of his Judicial powers because he was "the connecting link" between the police and the Judiciary of his district; or in other words, because the magistrate of the district finds it convenient and necessary to pull the wires of the Judiciary from behind in the administration of criminal justice. This officer has very candidly let the cat out of the bag, and it is in this admission that we find the real secret of the opposition to this reform. It is time that our opponents should have the courage to declare publicly, as Mr. James declared, what the real objection is, and not take shelter behind supposed financial difficulties. Fortunately for us, the reform which we advocate is not one which originated with the Congress, nor is it one which affects the interests of any particular class of our people. There is no race question involved, nor does the advocacy of this reform suggest any alarming issues or arguments based upon the stability of the empire. The non-official European community are as much interested in this question as the people of the country, and even as regards the official classes I am glad to feel that the sympathies of nearly one half of the Indian Civil Servants themselves, namely, the members of the Judicial branch, are entirely on our side. (Cheers.) That being so, I feel that if we persistently agitate for this reform we shall, as the President observed, be within measurable distance of attaining the object we have in view.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of India cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to India (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with India, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of India can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., Trinity Street, Cambridge; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

India presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, APRIL, 1896.

THE REAL MOTIVE POWER.

The *Madras Review*, we are glad to see, commences a second volume with fresh spirit. In its February number it applies a restrained, yet firm and vigorous, criticism to some recent official views regarding the progress of the Madras Presidency. The Government is, of course, entitled to set forth its conceptions of the state of the country and the causes influencing it. But it is encouraging to find that a local Reviewer has the nerve and the knowledge necessary to place before the public the different point of view of intelligent natives. This encouragement is all the more gratifying when the Reviewer confines himself strictly to fair argument, takes pains to discriminate judicially the objects of his blame and the weight of his censure, and even goes to the trouble to point out, what ought to be sufficiently obvious, that "a criticism of the official view of the progress of the country and a statement of the native view of such progress, however distasteful it might be, must not be regarded as an indication of irreconcilable hostility, but rather as an invitation to a careful consideration of the conclusions put forward." The judicious sobriety of the writer adds weight to his criticisms.

The document under review is the Blue-book entitled "Forty Years Progress of the Madras Presidency," recently issued from the Government Press under the name of the Hon. Dewan Bahadur S. Srinivasa Raghava Iy[illegible]r, C.I.E., and introduced to the English public in a clever article by Mr. Rees, who was private secretary to Lord Connemara, and who was associated with Mr. Iyengar "in the inception and the execution of his work." The official team is a strong one, and a team driven by the late Governor himself. It is scarcely surprising, then, to find home rule painted in colours that contrast darkly with the colours representing English rule. "The Blue-book," says the writer in the *Madras Review*, "gives a dark picture of the Madras Presidency under the native rule, and a still darker picture under the Muhammadan rule. It skips lightly over the first half of the century under the English sway, and in great detail depicts as an era of progress and reform the period comprising the next forty years." What is really wanted, for a true conception of the historical development and the future prospects of the country, is a plain and unvarnished record of the facts, with deductions carefully drawn and expressed. An inadequate representation of the facts, with deductions framed on mere prejudices, however it may glorify or humiliate in the meantime, merely misleads home opinion, official and public, and is thoroughly mischievous. To expose such misrepresentation, we strongly hold, is to perform a solid service of incalculable value to all that are honestly interested in the good government of the Presidency and of the country generally.

The main interest lies within the English period. The English claimed the proprietary right in all the lands either in virtue of the right of conquest or as successors to Muhammadans, or under the Hindu law—a claim inevitably prejudicial to private rights and oppressive in practice. They claimed also the Sovereign's right to half the produce. As the *Madras Review* says:

> "It is to us a marvel how a nation pretending to be civilised and professing to annex territories with the one single object of relieving the oppressed subjects from the tyranny of their Sovereign, could still enforce certain rights, merely because they had been enforced by their predecessors under the sanction of a savage law in the days of anarchy and misrule which immediately preceded their conquest. That savage law is now fiercely denounced in Turkey. Yet that is the very basis of the English revenue system.
>
> "That the established share of our Government in the produce of the land was 50 per cent. is admitted in the Fifth Report. The other half of the gross produce, left to the cultivator, would scarcely be sufficient for the support of himself and his family after defraying the cultivation expenses and the interest on the capital required for cultivation. A far greater share would often be necessary. We have also to remember that the Government share of the gross produce was levied *in money*. In 1817, the Madras Revenue Board found that the conversion of such share alone of the produce was, in some districts, as high as 60 or 70 per cent. of the whole; or, with the falling in prices towards the latter part of the first half of the century such conversion very often exceeded the entire gross produce. Thus even under the efficient and honest administration, an assessment of half the gross produce meant the ruin of the rayats.
>
> "But 'the demand on the cultivator was, however, by no means confined to the established rates of land tax or rent.' As a matter of fact, the amount levied on each rayat was really 'left to be determined at the discretion of the European or native revenue officers.' For it was the practice to *compel* the rayat to occupy as much land and consequently to pay as much revenue as they deemed proportionate to his circumstances; he was not allowed on payment even of the high survey assessment fixed on each field to cultivate only those fields to which he gave the preference; his task was assigned to him;

he was constrained to occupy all such fields as were allotted to him by the revenue officers. And whether he cultivated them or not, he was, as Mr. Thackeray emphatically terms it, 'saddled with the rents of each.' If the rayat was driven by these oppressions to fly and seek a subsistence elsewhere, he was followed wherever he went and assessed at discretion or deprived of the advantages he might expect to derive from a change of residence."

This oppressive situation was the natural outcome of the fact that the constant increase of the revenue constituted the collector's "strongest claim on the Revenue Board and the Presidency for praise and promotion." Now what expedients were employed to squeeze the miserable rayat?

"It was laid down in the instructions of collectors that they should not encourage the rayats to expect any remission; that, if the crop produced even less than the seed sown, the full rent should still be demanded; and if the rayat be unable to pay, the deficiency was required to be assessed *on the village*. And if the village could not pay, *on a neighbouring village*, limiting the re-assessment to a certain proportion lest it should injure next year's revenue."

Under such monstrous circumstances what sort of morality was likely to be developed in the rayat? Let one of the collectors tell his experience:

"The enormity of the land tax and the corruption of the subordinate officials have invariably tended to a natural progression to extortion on the one hand and to moral debasement on the other; violence, corruption, artifice, on the one hand are met by deceit, hypocrisy, and cunning on the other. What the one tries to extort the other endeavours to withhold. And universal degradation of character ensues. The basest principles of action are substituted for honesty and truth."

Every incitement to industry or improvement was crushed out; and what the Government locust left to the wretched rayat the rapacious underlying caterpillar ate up. Worse than all that has yet been stated were the revelations of the Torture Commission. There can be no question that "torture was applied openly in the presence of Europeans, without any attempt at concealment, and justified as being in accordance with Government orders." The practice in police cases was too vile for reproduction here. The principal tortures then in vogue in such cases form a sufficiently abominable and barbarous catalogue, not easily to be outdone in times of Muhammadan or Hindu ascendency; a record of villainy not readily to be expiated by generations of beneficent rule. As to revenue cases:

"The descriptions of violence commonly in vogue for revenue and other purposes, which were referred to in the course of this enquiry were as follows: 'Keeping a man in the sun; preventing his going to meals, or other calls of nature; confinement; preventing cattle from going to pasture by shutting them up in the house; quartering a peon on the defaulter, who is obliged to pay him daily wages; the use of the kittee; Anundal; squeezing the crossed fingers with the hands; pinches on the thighs; slaps; blows with fist or whip; running up and down; twisting the ears; making a man sit on the soles of his feet with brickbats behind his knees; putting a low caste man on the back; striking two defaulter's heads against each other, or tying them together by their back hair; placing in the stocks; tying the hair of the head to a donkey's or buffalo's tail; placing a necklace of bones, or other degrading or disgusting materials, round the neck; and, occasionally, though very rarely, more severe discipline still."

The practice of torture as a means for the realisation of the Government revenue continued, though in a mitigated form, down to 1855. The record is grievously shocking to Englishmen who, in these days, may well wonder with Sir John Kaye "how anything of the kind could ever have existed." At the same time, it is an element of the Administration that must come into the historical account; and the substance of it, as well as what the Madras Board declared to be "no exaggerated description" of the general situation, may be conveniently read in the notes to p. 225 of Kaye's "History of the Administration of the East India Company." "The policy followed towards Indian trade completed the ruin." The cotton duties are the merest bagatelle in comparison with the selfish and oppressive treatment of India by England in commercial relations during the first generation of the century. "The avowed principle was not free trade, but a selfish desire to benefit the English trade," and also the West Indian slave colonies and America.

These grave blots of administration are fairly pointed out by the hostile critic, and when he says with studied moderation that they were "simply disgraceful," a fair-minded Englishman can only remain dumb and ashamed. "Since the middle of the century," however, "there has undoubtedly been great progress":

"The great reforms in the internal administration of the country referred to in the Blue-book are the reduction of the land assessments, the construction of roads, railways, canals, the organisation of the police force, the prohibition of the employment of torture in the collection of the revenue; the great progress of local government is also sympathetically referred to. How was it, then, that during the first half of the century there was utter stagnation, while during the next forty years there was such remarkable progress? On this phenomena the Blue-book throws no light, and it was not, perhaps, intended to throw any."

The writer in the *Madras Review* supplies the omission. He points to the abject servility and helplessness of the people at the time when the English took possession; the effects of prolonged oppression in discouraging them from asserting the elementary rights of civilised existence; the disastrous results of the union in one person of the powers of magistrate, police officer, and taxgatherer; the bureaucratic ideas of the governing classes; the lack of education and of objects of reasonable aspiration. "Progress was impossible so long as high appointments in the services were refused to the Indians on account of their race disqualifications, so long as they were treated as helots unfit to be associated with the Englishmen in the administration of the country." But such appointments implied education. The efforts of Lord William Bentinck and Macaulay received a decided support and impulse to success from the reform agitation of the early thirties in England, which was directed to the condition of India by the protests of discerning and sympathetic Anglo-Indians. "It is instructive to consider the attitude generally of the Anglo-Indians towards this policy of Lord William Bentinck of admitting the natives to the higher grades in the service, and of disseminating modern culture among the upper classes with a view to their admission to such higher grades. Their attitude was one of bitter hostility, only equalled, or perhaps surpassed, by their attitude towards one [illegible] about fifty years later attempted to enforce the [illegible]ciples first publicly

avowed in Lord William Bentinck's time." Lord William Bentinck, on his return to England, declared, with perfect justice, "that it was only by enabling the natives of India to bring their complaints and grievances before the authorities and the public of England, and by persuading the 'globe-trotters' to report to their countrymen at home the nature of the circumstances of India, that the shameful apathy and indifference of Great Britain to India could be roused, and that the desired amelioration could be accomplished." Then, as now, the official apologists prophesied evil—the weakening of the governing hands, the increase of excitement in India, the stirring of discontent dangerous to peace. It is unnecessary to trace the operations of the London British India Society, the British India Committee, the India Reform Association, and the East India Association, the predecessors of the British Committee of the National Congress; or to follow the action of the various Native Associations in the Presidencies. We have said enough to point the conclusion of the writer in the *Madras Review* that "*it was not till the native and the English public opinion practically forced these reforms*" of the past forty years "*on the Indian Services that they were really carried out.*" The writer is careful to acknowledge the value of the sympathy and helpfulness of individual members of the Services; his condemnation falls upon the Services generally.

"In issuing the "Forty Year's Progress," the Government of Madras are only continuing the tradition of their predecessors. Everything that comes from the manufactory of the Government Press to extol the Indian Services, we would entreat the English public to accept with caution. The foundations of future progress have been well and truly laid. It is now impossible to stop the importation of the daily English papers, journals, and books into India. It is equally impossible to check the progress of English education. Secret and irresponsible government is then doomed. Privilege and monopoly must therefore cease to exist. Will Englishmen fight for them, or *will they accept the noble task of guiding India's tottering steps to equality?*"

There can be no question, happily, as to the good intentions of the English public. The misfortune is that, unless some strong and immediate pressure is applied, we are content to assume that everything is going on well in India; and the danger is that, when the stimulus to attention goads us keenly, we may act with more haste and vigour than knowledge and discretion. The public interest in Indian affairs may confidently be said to be largely on the increase, and with interest will come knowledge. At no time has it ever been more important that we should instruct ourselves in the current developments of Indian life and aspiration, so as to exercise a healthy influence, through wise methods, on the government and administration of the country.

CONGRESS ADDRESSES.[1]

When the history of parliamentary representation in India comes to be written, as we believe it will be written at some not far distant day, justice will no doubt be done to the unique character and importance of the Indian National Congress. While the list of the resolutions passed at the last Congress, resembling in so many of its items the resolutions of previous meetings, reminds us how difficult is the task of moving a bureaucratic Government, a rapid survey of the Presidential Addresses during the first decade of the Congress brings home to us the immense increase in the influence of that body, and its ever growing value as a bond of union between Indians of all classes and religions. Little more than ten years ago the first national assembly ever convened in India was attended by seventy-two representatives selected by various associations. Its avowed object—the promotion of national unity independent of all prejudices of class and race—was received with derision by unsympathetic observers, who did not hesitate to stigmatize the proposed union as impossible and denounce its purposes as disloyal, notwithstanding the most sincere professions of unswerving fidelity to British rule. In spite of angry opposition and contempt the Congress has steadily grown, until in December of last year the representatives had increased to sixteen hundred, although the numbers had been reduced several years previously to facilitate the progress of business. The charge of disloyalty needed no refutation. The very birth of the Congress was in itself the outcome of the firm belief on the part of our Indian fellow-subjects in the essential fairness of the British electorate, if only their interest could be roused; its continuance and development illustrate their conviction that constitutional agitation is the best means of obtaining redress of grievances. The expression of the national discontent at specific wrongs by such frank methods was alone sufficient evidence of their confident acquiescence in British rule in the main. None saw more clearly than the educated Indians who conceived the idea of the National Congress that only under British rule was such a scheme possible. It is in fact, as Mr. Mehta pointed out, no mere parasitic growth, but the direct outcome of ancient Indian institutions and British influence combined. The idea of representation is as natural to the village community, and to the caste, as it was to the Mark and the ecclesiastical system that gave England her Parliament. The British occupation has tended steadily to break down the barriers of caste and religion, in spite of the unworthy principle of "*Divide et impera*" which has been sometimes advocated, and more often employed, as the only safe principle of government in India. On the other hand, the abstract theory of a wider basis for the government of India has been approved by Viceroys and ministers of both parties alike; both have refused to extend to the theory more than a very grudging recognition in practice. Few probably foresaw the rapid development of the appreciation of representative institutions in India, or the ease with which the spirit of nationality would in a few years remove so many of the obstacles to combination offered by differences of religion and caste. It is not altogether surprising, therefore, that a right freely acknowledged in principle should after ten years' agitation have been churlishly withheld. When the strength of the opposition offered by the

[1] "Inaugural Addresses by Presidents of the Indian National Congress, with Mr. Charles Bradlaugh's Speech." Compiled by Dinker Vishnu Gokhale, B.A., Bombay.

official and military departments is estimated, when it is remembered how difficult a task it is to rouse the British elector to take an interest even in matters that affect him directly, and how slowly reform has progressed in England, our shame for the ungenerous response to the demands of India will be mingled with astonishment at the progress made towards the formation of a combined Indian people and representative institutions.

It was no ordinary task that the promoters of the Congress set themselves to face. Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsis, Christians, have been united by the idea of a common nationality, and work in perfect harmony. It is true that on social questions the difference of standpoint threatened to produce discord, but by a wise provision such topics were almost from the very first relegated to a separate meeting, and with the sole exception of the much exaggerated difference between the Social Conference and the political organisation at Poona the two congresses have worked with a noticeable absence of friction. Differences of creed, race, and language have been overcome by community of interests and aims, citizenship of a common empire, and a share in common burdens. The feeling of common nationality which gave rise to the Congress has received a great impetus from its rapid and robust growth. How far the new idea has superseded old prejudices may be seen from Rai Bahadur Charlu's Presidential address in 1891, where, in view of the proposal to hold a Congress in London, he discussed the wisdom of relaxing the religious prohibition against a voyage over sea, and said: "But if the worst [*i.e.*, "loss of caste] should happen there is already the "beginning of a Congress-caste fundamentally "based on Hinduism." The Indian Parliamentary Party and the British Committee are the allies and representatives in England of the National Congress, and proofs of the energy with which the work of reform is being pressed on at headquarters. All the energy that can be displayed will be needed, for the abuses of Indian administration are many, and the forces marshalled by custom and self-interest to oppose progress are strong; since these include the army and the official class whose privileges are the first to be threatened by the most pressing measure, financial reform. So long as government by Company existed the jealousy felt by Parliament and the necessity for a renewal of the Charter every thirty years were good guarantees against oppression. Now there is no real control by Parliament either of finance or any other department of the Indian Government. The Indian Budget, involving an expenditure of nearly twenty millions sterling more than the income of the United Kingdom at the beginning of the present reign, is still passed as a matter of form by the House of Commons, although not a taxpayer in India outside the Supreme Council has the slightest voice in the matter. To please the army, wars are carried on in the imaginary interests of the Empire and British "prestige," the Indian taxpayer is saddled with the burden of the expense, and scarcely a protest is heard in Parliament. In all Indian affairs the Secretary of State for India is guided by his official Council, and his decisions are supported, as the opinion of a specialist, by his colleagues in the Government, which is backed by the majority in the House of Commons. Such was the process by which the scheme for a system of peasant banks on the German plan to relieve the starving rayat was suppressed, although it had received the approval of the Bombay Government, Sir Evelyn Baring the Finance Minister, and other leading authorities. This is the means whereby such measures as Sir Charles Elliott's suppression of the jury system in Bengal are rendered possible. Hence it is that the unjust, illogical, and tyrannical concentration of judicial and executive functions in the same hands has been allowed to perpetuate in India a most glaring violation of every principle of equity and common sense, and a most satirical commentary on the traditional British love of fair play. So incurious is Parliament in reference to the methods and proceedings of the India Office that it has even allowed its own resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations to be disregarded.

That there is, however, an increasing interest in Indian affairs amongst Englishmen, a clearer perception of the poverty of the Indian taxpayer, and of the duties entailed upon us by the possession of our Indian empire, is due to the efforts of the Indian National Congress and its friends in England. Ten years is but a short period in Parliamentary history, and even if nothing had been achieved beyond the consolidation of the position of the Congress, that alone would be a reason for sanguine hopes as to the future. But something more has been done—little perhaps compared with what remains to be done, but much considering the short period of usefulness as yet enjoyed by the Congress and the difficulties that block the way. It is impossible even for the official opposition to neglect the opinion of a body composed of "representatives of every class and "creed, each elected by, and a representative of, the "whole mixed community of the place he represents, "on the basis of common interest and nationality." Many an official job has been prevented by the knowledge that enlightened criticism awaited it. Sir Charles Elliott's proclamation withdrawing trial by jury in serious cases from the courts of Bengal had to be cancelled within a year. The Jury Bill of last year was withdrawn in deference to the strong opposition organised mainly by the Congress. Finally, some concessions have been obtained in the matter of finance and of representation. It is not a great boon perhaps to have obtained, this Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, viewed in the light of past experience of such Commissions; but it indicates the awakening of the British public to the serious and critical state of things existing in India, and it is hard to believe that with the memory of the cotton duties still fresh in the minds of a large section of the community something will not be done to remedy the present infamous inequality of burdens and to charge Imperial revenue with the expenditure on Imperial projects. The provision made by Lord Cross's Indian Councils Bill for elected native representatives on the Legislative Councils is the most important and far-reaching measure yet passed in connexion with the reform of Indian government. It is true that the rules which were framed for the

carrying out of that Act amounted to an ungracious withdrawal in part of the boon already granted, and that the Act of 1861 removes all financial questions beyond the discussion of the Councils. But the recognition of the right to elective representation is not to be underestimated—a right which, to quote Mr. Webb's words, cost other nations centuries of toil and effort. Already the Congress has done good work, and more remains to be done—much, we believe, in the immediate future. And although what has been achieved has been largely in despite of the authorities, we believe with Mr. Pherozshah Mehta that "all the great forces of English life and "society, moral, social, intellectual, political, are, if "slowly, yet steadily and irresistibly declaring them-"selves for the choice which will make the connexion "of England and India a blessing to themselves and "to the whole world for countless generations." The great obstacle is the ignorance and apathy of the electorate, and that the Congress is doing much to dispel.

BUDDHIST LORE.[1]

Here is the first volume of a new series, which promises to be of great interest. Undaunted in his labours to bring home to the English-speaking world a knowledge of the religions of the East, and still unwearied after the superintendence of the publication of half a hundred volumes, Professor Max Müller deserves much credit for tackling the production of yet another set of Eastern religious works. In his editorial preface, he enters into some account of certain of his difficulties, and even defends himself from personal aspersions that might well have been spared. "The fact is," he explains, "that during all the years which I devoted to the superintending of the publication of the fifty volumes of the Sacred Books of the East, I have not had the smallest addition to my income. I was relieved by the University of Oxford from the duty of delivering my public lectures, so that I might devote my time to this large literary undertaking brought out by our University Press. . . . . I have never claimed any credit for the sacrifices which I have made, both in time and in money, for the objects which were near and dear to my heart." The disclaimer ought not to have been necessary. More than that, the immense service thus rendered to learning and to popular knowledge deserves, on the contrary, some distinctive token of public recognition. It is a great pleasure to us to acknowledge also the timely and effective assistance that has been rendered in starting this series by Chulâlankarana, King of Siam, who, "being desirous that the true teaching of the Buddha should become more widely known in Europe," was "graciously pleased to promise that material support without which the publication of these translations would have been impossible." It is to be hoped that the interest of the public in this work will encourage his Majesty to continue his liberality.

The object of the publication of these translations is undoubtedly one of material importance. "If," says Professor Max Müller, "the members of the principal religions of the world wish to understand one another, to bear with another, and possibly to recognise certain great truths which, without being aware of it, they share in common with one another, the only solid and sound foundation for such a religious peace-movement will be supplied by a study of the Sacred Books of each religion." This, of course, is quite true. At the same time, it must be frankly acknowledged that such a "religious peace-movement" must for a long time be confined to a chosen few, and that knowledge of each other's doctrines is not all that is needed in order to consummate a peace even on a basis of tolerance. When one considers the keenness of the edge of religious difference in England, where the means of knowledge of the different religious views have been ample for centuries, the ardour of one's hopes is sensibly cooled. Still it is well to remove obvious difficulties, and to do what can be done for the eventual triumph of sense and reason.

The *G*âtakamâlâ, or "Garland of Birth Stories," belongs to the Canon of the Northern Buddhists. For Europe, it was discovered by Mr. Brian H. Hodgson, to whom it was communicated by his old Patan monk. Professor Kern, appreciating its great literary merits, devoted immense labour to the production of an edition of the Sanskrit text, which Professor Max Müller says "is not only an *editio princeps*, but the text as restored by him will probably remain the final text." The present translation has been made by Professor Speyer, of Groningen, who has but seldom departed from the text of Kern. The collection is a Sanskrit rendering of thirty-four *G*âtakas, or homilies, ascribed to Arya *S*ûra, who selected them from the old and traditional store of *G*âtaka tales. The date of Arya *S*ûra is not definitely fixed. "Prof. Kern was induced," says Professor Speyer, "to place *S*ûra approximately in the century of Kâlidâsa and Varâhamihira, but equally favourable circumstances may be supposed to have existed a couple of centuries earlier. I think, however, he is posterior to the author of the Buddha*k*arita."

This, then, is a collection of homilies, each tale being treated after the fashion of a religious discourse. The text in each case consists of a simple prose sentence of ethical or religious purpose, which introduces the story and receives illustration by the story. The avowed object of the narrative is to rouse and invigorate the true faith in the mind of the reader; and the lesson turns on some event in a former existence of the Buddha. The elaborate prose is interspersed with clever verse. Let Professor Speyer describe the qualities of the composition:

"It has perhaps been the most perfect writing of its kind. Its verses and artful prose are written in the purest Sanskrit, and charm the reader by the elegance of their form and the skill displayed in the handling of a great variety of metres, some of which are rarely to be met with elsewhere, and are sometimes adorned with the additional qualities of difficult and refined rhymes and the like. Apparently *S*ûra, to whom the *G*âtakamâlâ is ascribed, was a poet richly gifted by Nature, whose talent must have been developed by thorough

[1] "The Sacred Books of the Buddhists." Edited by F. Max Müller. Volume I.: The *G*âtakamâlâ, by Arya *S*ura; translated by J. S. Speyer. (London: Henry Frowde.)

and extensive literary studies. Above all, I admire his moderation. Unlike so many other Indian masters in the art of literary composition, he does not allow himself the use of embellishing apparel and the whole luxuriant *mise en scène* of Sanskrit ala*m*kâra beyond what is necessary for his subject. His flowery descriptions, his long and elaborate sermons, his elegant manner of narration, are always in harmony with the scheme of the whole or the nature of the contents. Similarly, in the choice of his metres, he was guided by stylistic motives in accordance with the tone and sentiment required at a given point of the narrative."

The introductory text or maxim is repeated at the end as a conclusion of the story, and usually there are added, by way of epilogue, other moral lessons that may be illustrated by the story, or different subjects of religious discourses in connection with which the story may be turned to instructive account. Professor Speyer is of opinion that these epilogues are accretions posterior to *S*ûra; but he has had the good sense to translate them and print them in full.

The following remarks of Professor Max Müller throw useful light upon the principle and purpose of the tales:—

"This class of stories is peculiar to Buddhism; for, although the idea that every man had passed through many existences before his birth on earth, and will pass through many more after his death, was, like most Buddhist theories, borrowed from the Brâhmans, yet its employment for teaching the great lessons of morality seems to have been the work of Buddha and his pupils. In addition to this there was another theory, likewise Brâhmanic in its origin, but again more fully developed for practical purposes by the Buddhists, that of *Karma*, a firm belief that an unbroken chain of cause and effect binds all existences together. The great problems of the justice of the government of the world, of the earthly sufferings of the innocent, and the apparent happiness of the wicked, were to the Indian mind solved once for all by the firm conviction that what we experience here is the result of something that has happened before, that there is an unbroken heredity in the world, and that we not only benefit by, but also suffer from, our ancestors. In order fully to understand the drift of the *Gâtakas* we must, however, bear in mind one more article of the Buddhist faith, namely, that though ordinary mortals remember nothing of their former existences beyond the fact that they did exist, which is involved in the very fact of their self-consciousness, highly enlightened beings have the gift of recalling their former vicissitudes. . . . It seems to have been the constant habit of the historical Buddha, Buddha *S*âkyamuni, to explain to his disciples things that were happening by things that had happened countless ages before. Those lessons seem certainly to have impressed his hearers, after they once believed that what they had to suffer here on earth was not the result of mere chance, but the result of their own former deeds or the deeds of their fellow-creatures, that they were, in fact, paying off a debt which they had contracted long ago. It was an equally impressive lesson that whatever good they might do on earth would be placed to their account in a future life, because the whole world was one large system in which nothing could ever be lost, though many of the links of the chain of cause and effect might escape human observation or recollection."

Of course, it is difficult for ourselves to enter fully into the Buddhist views of the world; but at any rate Professor Max Müller thinks it necessary to warn the readers of these stories that "they must not imagine that highly-educated men among the Buddhists were so silly as to accept the *G*âtaka as ancient history." "A *G*âtaka," he points out, "was not much more than what a parable is with us; and as little as Christians are expected to accept the story of Lazarus resting in Abraham's bosom as a matter of fact were the Buddhists bound to believe that Buddha, as an individual or as an historical person, had formerly been a crow or a hare." The whole volume of stories is extremely interesting and instructive, and Christian readers that are unfamiliar with Buddhist morality and religion will find it full of surprises that ought to be of an agreeable quality.

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

We reproduce below General Sir Neville Chamberlain's important letter on Kafiristan which was read at the recent Conference at Westminster Palace Hotel. The letter was addressed to the secretary to the Aborigines Protection Society:

Lordswood, Southampton.

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 7th inst. I beg to assure you that the object for which your conference is to be held has my heartfelt sympathy, and I hope it may succeed in arousing the minds of the Government and the public generally to the urgency for such steps being taken as may yet be possible to avert the renewal of the invasion of Kafiristan by the troops of the Amír of Afghanistan; or, that if the Government considers that it cannot arrest a continuance of the invasion, it will, at all events, promptly and vigorously avail itself of every means within its power to mitigate the horrors which are the sure accompaniment of Afghan conquest; which are the more terrible when the vanquished, as infidels, are considered to be outside the pale of human mercy.

Who could have supposed a few years ago that the necessity would ever arise for Englishmen to have to assemble to plead the cause of a race whose history is lost in past ages, and whose heroic courage and love of independence have, up to within the last few months, preserved their homes from invasion by the implacable foe which has for centuries past encircled their territory?

Ever since the mission of Mountstuart Elphinstone to the Shah of Cabul in 1808 the Government of India and many persons of European nations have taken an interest in the race occupying the valleys geographically known as Kafiristan. This interest has naturally gone on increasing as the British frontier and influence have extended beyond the Indus, and we have been placed in a better position for acquiring more trustworthy information in regard to them. Such means as have been within our power have been employed to bring us into friendly communication with these people, and so far did we succeed in gaining their confidence and lead them to trust in our friendship, that some two years ago they allowed a British officer to enter their territory as a welcome guest. Indeed, it was considered to be the mission of the Government of India to afford such political and moral protection to the Kafir race as might be within its power, for it was felt that no national heroism, however great, could enable them to continue to successfully resist the attacks of their Muhammadan neighbours, now that these latter were armed with the weapons of modern warfare, whilst the Kafirs remained almost un-

possessed of firearms of any description, and had to rely, as of old, on bows and arrows and knives.

The views entertained by the Government of India upon the subject of Kafiristan were well known to the Amír, and His Highness at that time acted as if he was ready to meet its wishes.

Such was the position which the two Governments held towards each other until our intervention in the affairs of Chitral assumed the appearance of our intention to retain possession of that State. That measure was for various reasons most distasteful to the Amír, as also to the general feelings of the neighbouring Muhammadan tribes, and our relations at Cabul became less cordial.

In the autumn of 1893 Mr. (now Sir Henry) Durand was sent on a mission to Cabul to settle the Chitral and other outstanding questions, and this afforded an opportunity to the Amír to press for British acceptance of his claim to include Kafiristan as coming within his sphere of jurisdiction—a right, in one sense, more precious to His Highness than that to which he acceded in regard to Chitral.

Every previous ruler of Afghanistan, and every Afghan zealot, has always had at heart the conquest of the Kafir race, and now has come the time when everything appears to them opportune for the accomplishment of that long unfulfilled desire. The bloody work of conquest has, we are told already proceeded apace. Gold medals are said to have been presented by the Amír to the successful generals, and the subjugation of the unhappy people is to be proceeded with as soon as the season will permit.

It is true that we have been assured through the Press, on the authority of an Englishman lately returned from Cabul, that little was talked of in that capital as to what was taking place in Kafiristan: whilst it was stated that the object of the Amír was merely to open up a new route to his province of Badakshan for his own purposes, as also to assist the English to defend India: and that it was therefore better to do such work in time of peace than to wait until the emergency arose. Those who can credit such a pretext must indeed be easily deceived. My own conviction is that these reasons were assigned by the Amír in order to throw the British public off its guard, until such time as the desired end was accomplished: after which interposition would no longer be of any avail.

I do not believe that the people of England can form any idea of the deeds of an outrage that have already been committed during the successes said to have been organised by the Amír's forces: and I believe that there will be neither the inclination nor the power on the part of his officers to repress in the future a repetition of the same acts of cruelty and shame. There is no abomination known to man that will not find vent during the subjection of the unhappy race now called upon to defend all that is most cherished in this life by men, women, and children.

In support of my belief as to what will occur should the soldiery and their accompanying Ghazis be left to work their will, full confirmation is to be found in what took place a few years ago when the Hazara tribe had to succumb to the Afghan troops. The men were mercilessly slaughtered after a brave but vain resistance. As to the women and children we are told by an English surgeon who was in the service of the Amír that Cabul was overstocked by them. Neither age nor position, nor any family tie afforded any protection to these prizes of Afghan conquest, and for as long as life remains to these unfortunate creatures they will continue to be at the mercy of their owners. If such was the tyranny imposed on a tribe which acknowledged the Muhammadan prophet, what clemency can the people of Kafiristan expect? It is true that the people of Hazara are of the Sheeah persuasion, and as such are not accepted by their Sunnee co-religionists as of the orthodox faith — and consequently they are despised by the Pathan and Afghan races.

Although I have felt compelled to denounce the acts of a nation professing the Muhammadan religion, I must affirm that I have done so without being in any way prejudiced against the Afghans on account of their faith. Indeed, I believe I have the right to say that their Prophet severely forbids and pronounces future condign punishment to every one of his followers who approaches the Almighty in his name, who shall commit the inhuman acts now permitted to go unchecked in the dominion of the Amír of Afghanistan.

Our justification for urging upon His Highness to put an end to such atrocities rests upon the grounds that we placed him upon the throne: that we have guaranteed him against foreign aggression: that we have maintained him in power by our influence and moral support: that we have granted him a large annual subsidy, and that it is the British Government which has equipped his military forces.

What more could a great power do for a neighbouring Sovereign. And who can deny that such acts of friendship do not confer upon England the right to insist upon the repression of cruel wrongs which have as yet cried out in vain for redress?

I have now given my reasons for wishing success to the cause you advocate, and I can only trust that in any engagements entered into by our Government with the Amír in regard to Kafiristan, no promise can be accepted as valid until it has been carried into effect.—Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Neville Chamberlain,
General.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

General dissatisfaction seems to pervade all classes in India at the manner in which the cotton duties have been finally re-arranged. No one can be surprised at this for the net results of this re-arrangement are to relieve the rich of taxation to the extent of 37 lakhs and to impose on the poor a further burden of at least 10½ lakhs, and this distinctly unjustifiable measure is virtually asserted by the Indian officials to have been forced on them by the India Office here.

How this latest development was actually evolved it is not easy to realize. First under dire financial pressure, the Indian Government obtained permission to put cotton goods on the same footing as

other imported articles and levy on them the same import duty as paid by these, viz., one of 5 per cent. *ad valorem*. That these goods had been originally excluded from the schedule of duty-paying imports was a scandal, and characteristic of the manner in which ministers and officials here truckle to powerful interests. They had truckled to Manchester as others truckle to the parsons and the publicans. But heedful of the outcry Manchester would be sure to raise at this small act of simple justice, and in order to anticipate any charge of protection, the authorities settled that yarns above 20's whether imported or manufactured in India should pay a 5 per cent. duty. Time passed, and the election being at hand the Tories went about sympathizing with the cruel injustice (!) done by the imposition of the 5 per cent. duties and expatiating on the great things that they would do for Manchester if they were returned to power.

They were returned to power, and then—they began with one accord to make excuses. Still they had said so much, especially Lord George Hamilton, that in common decency they had to do something.

Now the position of affairs was this; in the matter of cloths made with 20's and other lower count yarns, there was absolutely no competition. With cheaper labour and abundant short-stapled cotton, quite suited to 20's and lower counts, on the spot in India, England could not compete with India, and in all the years between 1882 and 1895, during which the trade was perfectly free, England never exported any appreciable quantity of these qualities of goods, save only where one special denomination, viz., drills, was concerned, and as these required a longer and stronger fibre than India produces, India could not turn these out at a profit, and so even in this one minor class there was no competition.

On the other hand in printed and coloured goods, of no matter what qualities, there was no appreciable competition, because there was not one single printing mill or dye-works in India.

Again in cloths woven from 30's and higher counts there was no appreciable competition. Indian cotton does not run to these, and the entire trade was practically in England's hands.

It was in cloths made from yarns between 20's and 30's that alone any real competition between the products of the looms of England and India existed; towards the lower limit India, towards the middle and right on to the higher limit England had the best of it.

Whilst the India Office was looking about anxiously to discover what it could decently do, by way of a sop to Manchester, the latter started the proposition that India, paying only on yarns, while they paid on the cloth, was really protected to the extent of 1½ per cent. The way they put it was somewhat as follows: England exports to India Rs.100 worth of cloth, and on that pays a 5 per cent duty, viz. Rs.5. An Indian manufacturer pays a 5 per cent. duty on Rs.70 worth of yarn, viz., Rs.3·8, but out of this yarn he produces Rs.100 worth of cloth, on which he will only have paid an excise of 3½ per cent., viz., Rs.3·8, against the 5 per cent. Manchester pays.

This was a very plausible argument, and though when account was taken of the fact that the Indian mills had to pay duty on machinery, china-clay, and other necessary imported stores, it seemed clear that India's gain could not exceed ½ per cent., if it existed at all, still to settle the bugbear of protection, the Indian mill-owners were quite willing that in the case of all English cloths which their goods competed with, the duty should be reduced to 3½ per cent., while India continued to pay 5 per cent. on the yarn she used whether home-made or imported.

Of course the only statesmanlike manner of dealing with the question would have been, while leaving the duties on all the English goods untouched, to abolish the yarn duties and place a 5 per cent. *ad valorem* excise duty on all cloths into whose composition any yarn of higher count than 20's entered, turned out from the Indian mills. This would have imposed no extra burthen on the poor, nor would it have involved any relinquishment of duties paid by the rich, a relinquishment wholly indefensible looking to the conditions that prevail in India. The small surplus, which has been made the pretext for the relinquishment of taxation already referred to, was only the accidental result of a temporary fluctuation in the exchange, just as likely as not to be followed six months hence by an equal or greater deficit. Even were this not so, while the starving millions in India pay a 4,000 per cent. tax on their salt (Rs.2·8 a maund on what can be produced for one anna a maund), while the famine insurance fund is starved, while the resources of all Provincial Governments, on which the welfare of the people so greatly depends, are constantly confiscated for Imperial purposes, while public works' developments are stunted and innumerable administrative reforms of the greatest urgency have to remain in abeyance, it is not to providing a sop for Manchester, but to ameliorating the condition of the Indian masses that any improvement in India's finances should have been devoted.

This statesmanlike course did not apparently suit the India Office—something had to be done for Lancashire, and one can therefore understand why the course above indicated, the only right and proper course, was rejected. But why the sensible compromise proposed by Bombay, by which Manchester's payments on all cloths which Indian mills also turn out should be reduced to 3½ per cent. while the mills should continue to pay 5 per cent. on their yarns, should also be rejected, is very hard to understand.

Supposed protection of Indian cotton goods as against English manufactures was the sole pretext for any re-arrangement. The Bombay proposal completely swept away, indeed, more than swept away, any possible protection of the nature alleged, and, what was more, it involved a specially kindly concession to Manchester, other British manufacturers of articles which have to compete with Indian local manufactures gaining no such reduction of the 5 per cent. duty. Here was a special favour to Manchester, and a complete estoppel to the cry about protection. What more could even Lord George Hamilton desire?

Why he did it no mere mortal could understand—but what he did was this; desiring apparently to exemplify the saying that it is always the unexpected that happens, he suddenly descended like a god from his car on the Government of India and

compelled them, (so at any rate we read between the lines of the Council speeches,) against their better judgment, to abolish the duties on all yarns and impose an import and excise duty of 3½ per cent. on all cloths English and Indian.

It is incomprehensible; the only pretext for a re-arrangement was the protection afforded by the old arrangement. What has been done? The duties on all printed and coloured goods and all fine goods made with 30's and higher counts, in which there was no protection, have been lowered to 3½ per cent. to please Manchester, and save the pockets of the rich who alone use these fabrics, while *per contra*, Lord G. Hamilton has put a duty of 3½ per cent. on cloths made from yarns of 20's and lower counts, hitherto free, and has thus added 10½ lakhs to the burthens of the Indian poor, many thousands of whom are this day actually starving and millions on millions of whom are ever on the verge of starvation.

What is more, by abolishing the duty on yarns, Lord G. Hamilton has granted protection to the hand-loom weavers and to the power-looms situated in Native States (and between them they use nearly two-thirds of all the yarn used in India) to the extent of at least 3½ per cent., and all this by way of doing away with any protection.

It is incredible — clearly there has been some oversight. Many here are striving to have the whole matter reconsidered and we cannot but think that Lord George Hamilton, when he comes to review the question in all its aspects, will see his way, at any rate, to exempting cloths entirely composed of 20's and lower counts from all duties, whether of import or excise—which would relieve the new arrangements of at least one most indefensible feature. A. O. H.

THE SCOPE OF THE "MANDATE."

[From an Anglo-Indian Correspondent.]

The Cotton Duties crisis has blown over for the present, but the bitterness remains. Though Lancashire is tranquillised, the Indian Empire is not appeased, nor will it be. Few of our public men here have any due conception of the depth and breadth of the disgust and indignation amongst all classes in India, because, first, of the exemption of cotton goods from the tariff of 1894; next, though in less degree, because of the excise imposed when, in 1894, those goods were subjected to customs duties; and now, with five-fold more intensity, because of a one-sided inequitable revision of the tariff having been forced through the Supreme Legislative Council in the interests of a small but powerful class of the present Ministry's supporters. This latter count of the indictment is emphasised by the fact that the change was made before the Secretary of State had taken time to consider those protests and explanations from India for which he had promised to wait. As to the prevalence of this grave accusation, one need only quote—from amongst scores of instances—the following from the *Bombay Gazette*: "There is no more hesitation in public assemblies than in the press to charge the Secretary of State with breach of faith in having, despite his solemn promises, decided upon the policy to be pursued without having looked into the case put forward on behalf of India." As to the general arguments against the mode of this enforced "final" adjustment, those have been fully set forth in these columns; but, in order that busy public men may have a chance to realise the intensity of discontent aroused by this fiscal *coup d'état*, would I again refer them to full reports of the public gatherings in India, more especially to that crowded and influential town's meeting convened by the Sheriff of Bombay, which is fully reported in the weekly summaries from that city, dated February 1st.

Coming to the more special aspect of this fevered episode in recent Indian affairs; one would like to impress on our too easy-going politicians that not only has the anger and scorn aroused been general, but that those feelings have been most emphatically expressed by the European portion of the Indian population. Here, at once, is a test and a portent. It is inevitable, to some extent, that Anglo-Indians and the people of the country should incline to regard public affairs from different standpoints; while the, often erroneously assumed, rivalry in class or personal interests sometimes prevents the two races from acting in concert regarding public questions. Thus, tried by the test of unanimity, wonderful from its rarity, the co-operation of Anglo-Indians in denouncing the recent transaction between Lancashire and the Secretary of State cuts short any argument or apologies. This mandate stands finally condemned, without opening for appeal—only steady, persistent demand for repeal. As to "portent," perhaps admonition would be the better term, for it will apply to both parties—non-official Anglo-Indians and their bureaucratic rulers. The suggestion naturally arises, seeing that Europeans and Indians have in this instance found themselves in the same boat (though, as Jerrold remarked, with different sculls) in vindicating public interests and equitable principles, why should not the former be more ready than hitherto in associating their public efforts with the people of "the land they live in," when fiscal, financial, and public works questions arise in respect of which neither racial nor political differences exist, and in regard to which the interests of all classes and races dwelling in the great peninsula are equally concerned? Here, in passing, I may recall the name of George Yule, as one, amongst a few others of the dominant race, who have heartily co-operated with the intelligent and public-spirited portion of the sons of the soil. It is possible that some such fruitful union for public purposes may be one of the by-products left from the high tide of this cotton-duty crisis. If so, some of the placemen who make a mockery of "legislation's sovereign powers," by thrusting the "mandate" in the face of their non-official colleagues, will find the task more difficult when they again essay to defy that genuine public opinion which has presented itself in united form during the recent crisis.

This brings me to the second noticeable point in the attitude and temper of Anglo-Indians during this vigorous agitation. The one incident of all

others that impressed them in the course taken by the Indian Government in forcing the Bill (now an Act) through the Legislative Council, was that it was directly due to "orders from home," that the Viceroy and his colleagues obsequiously accepted the "mandate" of the Secretary of State in London. They could go far in excusing the official members for thus voting to order; but when it was claimed by the Executive that the "additional," that is, the non-official members, partly nominated and partly elected, were also under compulsion to vote as the Secretary of State had bidden them, every political instinct of the true Briton rose up against this emasculation of the representative principle. It is true that the claim had been affirmed on the former occasion, in December, 1894, when the exemption of cotton was to cease and import duties to be off-set by the Excise. Lord Elgin partly set himself to justify the doctrine of "mandate," applying it, as against Sir Griffith Evans (a nominated barrister member), so as to include all members of the Legislature. His lordship, indeed, avoided in that instance attributing the compulsory authority to the Secretary of State. He said, "Every man who sits here sits by the authority and sanction of Parliament, and to say that he can refuse to obey the decisions of Parliament would be absurd." This, however, was only, and for the immediate purpose, to avoid disclosing the real objective—the Secretary of State. Sir James Westland, on the same occasion, carried the argument a step further in a passage of some ingenuity (which need not be quoted here). He hinted that the power over *all* the members lay with "the ultimate deciding power in Executive matters."[1]

To this complexion, in its naked form, the issue has been brought in the recent controversy. Hence, as I have said, with all of British race, in addition to many Indians, has been raised a strong protest against what they regard as violation of the independence and responsibility of legislators, even under the hybrid form which obtains in the Indian Legislative Councils. The Anglo-Indian press expressed that resentment in vigorous fashion, to an extent and in terms which our press here only uses under circumstances of extreme provocation. If a list of these journalistic protests could be compiled it would astonish not only the Executive authorities here, but also that limp creature "the average member." But it would also demonstrate that "the last straw" was the "mandate" which broke down that patience in political matters which generally obtains amongst mercantile and other Europeans in India. The *Times of India* said, "This is the system of 'mandate' with a vengeance;" "if Lord George Hamilton had desired to exasperate public opinion in this country, to convince it that the Viceroy's Government is powerless to protect its interests . . . . and that the Legislative Council is a helpless automaton;" "they (the Viceroy and the Executive) appear to have their orders and they know of no other way of dealing with orders from the India Office than giving to them an unquestioning obedience"; "obstruction . . . . is a process which cannot be carried far in India, and no one would willingly see it introduced in a Legislative Council . . . . (but,) when the cause makes so imperative a claim as it does in this instance, it might be resorted to with no misgivings"; "the Home Government are determined that Indian finances and legislation shall be regulated in callous disregard for the interests of the people of the land"; "having had such convincing proofs that they must not look for protection to the Secretary of State or to a Legislature over which his control threatens to be absolute, they should now look in other directions"—and so on. It must be admitted that these, and scores of similar passages that might be cited, are strong enough even for an "independent" Irish press; but they express the sentiments of the ruling race in India in this instance. From such language even those of our public men who are usually indifferent to the affairs of that dependency may learn how deep is the wound inflicted on the Indian community, as a whole, by thus subordinating its equitable claims to class interests in England under the pressure of political and party expediency.

But, after all, regarding the doctrine of "mandate" as a whole, there is a broader view of the subject which has been usefully brought to notice by an Anglo-Guzerati journal, the *Kaiser-i-Hind*, of Bombay. After remarking "it is manifest that the Government of India has made a grave political blunder of the first magnitude by its latest attempt in the direction of legislation by mandate," the writer proceeds :—

> "The 'mandate' theory is a most dangerous theory. In our opinion it is a double-edged instrument of torture and oppression. It will cut India both ways. If you cry aloud in the future, pointing out the present striking instance of what an arbitrary Secretary of State dare do, and agitate that in future the Government of India should never heed the mandates of the Mahârâjâ for the time being ensconed on the Imperial *Gadee* at Westminster, you do not exercise that political sagacity and foresight which are so much needed for keeping the Indian administration, secret and irresponsible as it is, on its good behaviour. For it should be well remembered that to one mandate of the character against which we are presently inveighing, and inveighing with justice, there are nine others in which the Secretary of State is more in the right and endeavours to act more as an earthly Providence between the despotic Government of India on the one hand and the helpless and unrepresented people of the country on the other. This is an *historical* fact, and can be verified. It will be evident, therefore, that on the whole the 'mandates' of the State Secretary have generally worked in and on behalf of the interests of the people as against the beneficed bureaucracy and their friends who belong to the governing classes, who, therefore, are justly denominated the unbeneficed bureaucracy."

It is not needful to criticise this passage; though it would be serviceable if we could have a *precis* of the "historical facts" going to show that in nine cases out of ten the "mandate" of the Secretary of State has been on behalf of "the helpless and unrepresented people." That may have been so if we go far enough back—these instances relate more to executive orders than to legislative policy—but one finds that within the last dozen years or so the

[1] Those who wish to study the subject on its juridical side in the light of the history of the Indian Legislative Councils, may be referred to two papers in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* (April, 1895, No. 18), one by Mr. Justice C. D. Field, the other by Mr. J. W. Neil, I.C.S., formerly Judicial Commissioner of the Central Provinces.

balance has been the other way. The broader aspect of the question is fitly described thus:—

"We therefore, repeat, and raise our warning voice, that our countrymen should not be carried away by the temporary excitement of the hour in entirely condemning the mandate theory. A calm and careful consideration of the *pros* and *cons* will at once lead to the conviction that though the mandate theory sometimes works against their best interests, as in the present case, on the whole it is calculated to do more good than harm to our cause."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Laurence Hugh Jenkins, of Lincoln's Inn, barrister-at-law, to be a Judge of the High Court of Calcutta, in the room of Mr. Justice Pigot, who has retired.

Mr. Jenkins, who succeeds Mr. Jones Quain Pigot, is the son of a solicitor at Cardigan. He was born in 1858, is a graduate of University College, Oxford, and has been at the Bar for the past thirteen years.

The *Law Journal* contradicts the report that Mr. Bompas, Q.C., has been offered the Chief Justiceship of the High Court of Calcutta. It is suggested that some time must elapse before any appointment is made, as Sir William Comer Petheram will not retire until September.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Francis Charles Le Marchant as a member of the Council of India, in succession to Mr. Bertram Currie, whose tenure of the office expired in December last.

Sir W. Wedderburn has followed up his questions on the subject of the evictions and sales for the recovery of land revenue in the Madras Presidency with a request for a comprehensive Return which will show the accurate figures under the most important heads. The Return is to give, for each of the years 1883-4 to 1893-4 inclusive, the total cultivated area in acres, the total waste acres, the total notices of sale, the total defaulters whose property was sold, details of the property sold (showing the estimated value in rupees of the real and the personal property respectively), the amount realised by actual sale, and the total number of acres sold (*a*) to Government and (*b*) to others. The figures stated in Sir W. Wedderburn's questions were taken from the official reports of the Revenue Board, but owing, we understand, to a printer's error, two trivial inaccuracies crept in which had the effect of under-stating the facts. Lord George Hamilton, whose answer is dealt with elsewhere, made a rather questionable use of this slip. His own Return will now place the grave facts fully before the public on the explicit authority of the India Office.

Sir Seymour King M.P., has given notice that on an early day he will move for an address for copy of despatch, with enclosures from the Government of India, No. 15, Public Works, dated 28th January, 1890, regarding the rate of exchange for the pensions of certain Government servants in India; and for an address for copy of report of the Committee which sat at Simla in 1894 under the Presidency of Mr. R. D. Lyall, I.C.S., to investigate the best means for reducing the establishment charges and expenses in the Military Works and Public Works Departments

On March 17th Sir John Lubbock—the author of a volume upon the pleasures of life—presented to the House of Commons an amusing petition purporting to come from the Kammalars of Southern India. Somehow or other a verbose paragraph was circulated among the newspapers setting forth the objects of the petition. But its history is more aptly stated by the *Madras Standard*, whose account, as Sir John Lubbock may not yet have read it, we reproduce here:

The South India Visvakulotharana Association (is it a joke?) recently submitted two bound volumes, containing respectively, a petition in original, and a printed copy thereof, "exposing the intentions and aims of the so-called Indian National Congress," with the request that they may be submitted to Parliament. The Madras Government forwarded the precious indictment to the Government of India—at whose expense, we are not told—and informed the petitioners that the Government washed their hands of any further responsibility in the matter. But they desired the Government of India to let them know whether they were in future to send petitions to Parliament other than appeals against the orders of the Secretary of State. The Government of India have informed the local Government that all petitions to the Houses of Parliament should be presented unofficially and not be transmitted through the Government of India or the Secretary of State. The petitioners were to be informed that they must present their petition through the medium of some unofficial member of the House. But the Kammalars (goldsmiths) of South India neglecting their peaceful avocation to indulge in the warlike demonstration against the "so-called Indian National Congress"—that is the contemptuous manner in which the Madras Government and the Government of India speak of the Congress—is so prodigious a joke that we can only regret so much fuss should have been made of it.

Mr. A. Nundy, who during the past few months has been an active member of the British Committee, left London on March 30th for Naples, *en route* for Calcutta. A few days before he left he read a paper, on the Union of Indian Christians, at the first public meeting of the Indian Christian Association of Great Britain, held at the Y.M.C.A., Aldersgate Street, E.C., under the presidency of Mr. W. S. Caine. Mr. Nundy said that it had been the desire of Christians in India for some time to form a Christian Union among themselves, and he deplored the wrangling that arose from sectarian prejudices largely infused into new converts by the various missionary denominations. The time had come for Indian Christians to organise a union among themselves, and to drop all denominational distinction. Dr. Jenkins, Mr. Percy Bunting, and others also spoke.

The Directors' Report on the Empire of India Exhibition of 1895, already dealt with in the press, does justice to the valuable co-operation rendered by the "Society for Encouragement and Preservation of Indian Art," which, alike through the work of the Indian artisans and the contributions of Indian Princes and Chiefs to the Loan Collection, greatly enhanced the interest of the Exhibition. The S.E.P.I.A. intends, we understand, to follow up the encouraging protection it has already afforded to the decorative handicraft art-work of India with a collection of its own, which is to be shown at the Albert Hall during a few weeks in May and June next. This will be somewhat on the same plan as that adopted by the

"Home Arts and Industries Association" in the same building. For us the interest attaching to this renewed effort of the S.E.P.I.A. consists in the direct communication that has been fairly initiated with the Indian artisans themselves. Efforts are being made—in which many Indians will, we trust, be induced to co-operate—in extending and applying on the spot that direct personal encouragement to the too long neglected art-workers in all provinces of India which the Society has done so much to initiate, and with great success. It has proved that there is active and appreciative demand here for Indian art-work, in metals, woods, ivory, and textiles of all sorts, where the genuineness in material and design can be assured.

By the death of Lady Burton the world has lost one of the most powerful and romantic female figures of modern times. She cannot be considered apart from her husband, nor did she ever wish to be. The history of her life is the history of her love for Sir Richard Burton, that "modern Paladin" and "Crichton of the day," as she once described him in a girlish letter to her mother. When she first saw Captain Burton at Boulogne, she turned round to her sister and said, "That man will marry me." She tells us that when he proposed to her she felt "as if the moon had tumbled down and said, 'I thought you cried for me, and so I came.'" Forty years later she "consecrated" her husband's biography, "To my Earthly Master. Meet me soon—I wait the signal." There is something Oriental and foreign to Western sentiment in the utter self-effacement of this wifely devotion. Yet here, too, she displays her spiritual kinship with her husband, in whose nature the eternal contradiction of East and West seems to have been all but completely solved.

It is amusing to compare some of Mr. Lecky's latest utterances with his earlier. For instance, in his new work on "Democracy and Liberty" there is an important passage in defence of university representation in general, and of the representation of Dublin University in particular. But here is a passage from his "History of England in the Eighteenth Century":

> No other constituencies represent so exclusively the highly educated classes as the Universities, and the political influence of the Universities has been almost uniformly hostile to political progress. It is very necessary that opinions which have been formed in the drawing-room or the study should be brought in contact with that shrewd middle-class intellect which judges questions on broader issues, and sometimes with larger sympathies. There are, it is true, great sections of the community who are quite incapable of forming any reasonable or competent judgment on political question; but they, too, have their interests, which may be injured, and it is right that their sufferings and their real or fancied grievances should find a voice in the Legislature. In politics the evils that spring from monopoly are sometimes even graver than the evils which spring from incompetence. ("History of England in the Eighteenth Century," III., pp. 215-216.)

But after all, (as the *Daily News* says) why should not philosophers change their minds, as well as the rest of the world? As one of the most distinguished of their number asked, why should all the most valuable privileges be reserved for fools?

The death of Judge Hughes, at the ripe age of seventy-three, removes from English life one of its most striking figures. The author of the most successful boy's book ever written, and the last survivor of the group of "Christian Socialists" which included men like Maurice and Kingsley, was not an ordinary person. "Tom" Hughes was the muscular Christian to perfection, and (says the *Manchester Guardian*) we do not use the terms with any suggestion of disparagement or irony. They do not, it is true, imply the subtlest intellect or the austerest spirituality. Judge Hughes was neither a philosopher nor a saint, but he was "a broad-shouldered genial Englishman," with a natural preference, thoroughly well cultivated, for everything that was brave and honest and manly, and with a large affectionate heart.

His political opinions were those of the *Spectator*, a little old-fashioned, therefore, and much less democratic than he imagined, and only "Liberal" by courtesy. The great schoolmaster from whom he learned so much was a Liberal and a democrat in a far deeper and truer sense than his pupil. But even in politics Judge Hughes rendered services by his attitude throughout the American civil war, and he was one of the Englishmen most liked and trusted in the United States. It may seem an easy thing to write a story of school life, but the facts show that to do so without being either twaddling or sentimental is extremely difficult, and "Tom Brown's School Days" remains to this day without an equal and almost without a rival. That book has helped to mould the characters of many generations of English boys, and it has taught them nothing but what was honest and good. The writer of it is sure of a place in the memory and affection of his countrymen.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

SIR J. WESTLAND'S STATEMENT FOR 1896–97.

On March 18th the Secretary of State for India received the following telegram from the Viceroy:—

"Sir J. Westland will to-day present the financial statement for 1896-97 in the Legislative Council of the Governor-General. The statement begins by announcing the restoration of the famine insurance grant, with effect from the date of its suspension. The amount will, however, for the present be taken at Rx. 1,000,000 instead of Rx. 1,500,000, this amount being considered, on a review of 15 years' transactions, to make sufficient provision for present needs.

"The accounts for 1894-95 closed Rx. 259,000 better than the revised estimate of the year, but as the famine insurance grant involves an additional charge of Rx. 557,000, the result on the whole is a surplus of Rx.693,000, against Rx.991,000 estimated last March. The result in the revised estimate for 1895-96 is that, after paying the charges of the Chitral expedition—Rx. 1,750,000, besides £16,000 sterling in England—and restoring the famine insurance grant to the extent mentioned and repaying the provincial contribution, aggregating Rx. 405,000, levied in 1894-95, there is a surplus of Rx. 951,000. Of this great improvement in the financial position Rx. 1,436,000 is ascribed to smaller charges for ex-

change as 13·68d. has been realized against 13·[illegible]d. originally estimated, and English expenditure was £249,000 less than the estimate. Rx. 197,000 arises from better opium revenue and Rx. 676,000 from short payments under the same head, the crop having again been short. There is an improvement of Rx.243,000 under other principal revenue heads and Rx.462,000 savings under ordinary military expenditure, prices during this year having been favourable.

"The Government base their Budget estimate for 1896-97 on a 1s. $1\frac{3}{4}$d. rate of exchange, being desirous of avoiding all speculation as to maintenance of better rates established during the last two months. At this rate the estimate shows a surplus of Rx.463,000. Compared with last year's estimates, there is a falling off in land revenue of Rx.276,000, due to unfavourable agricultural prospects, and in Customs of Rx. 333,000, due to reduction of scale of cotton duties. Railways also will produce slightly less net earnings, but other revenue heads show considerable improvement, and the expenditure shows little increase. A special grant of Rx.495,000 is made for army mobilization, chiefly purchase of animals and material for transport and 1,000 reserve artillery horses. A large programme of railway capital expenditure is laid down—viz., Rx. 7,270,000 on State lines, including East Indian Railway and Bengal-Assam Railway, besides Rx. 1,150,000 advance to Bengal-Nagpur Railway and Indian Midland Railway for their extensions. These figures do not include other companies' construction.

"It is announced, with the usual reserve, that the Secretary of State for India proposes to draw for £16,500,000, and that a rupee loan of four crores will be raised in India."

The Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed on March 19th:—

"Sir J. Westland in his Budget speech deals at length with the famine insurance grant. He shows that, although the Government have occasionally had to give up the self-imposed obligation of providing one-and-a-half crores annually, yet in 15 years they have set aside 17 crores 64 lakhs of revenue for purposes of famine relief and insurance, almost entirely the latter, and have further realised a surplus of over seven crores. Only 31 lakhs have been actually spent on famine relief, while 18 crores and $65\frac{1}{2}$ crores have been spent upon protective, irrigation, and railway works respectively. Further, upon the guarantee of the insurance grant, capital has been raised for the construction of the Indian Midland and Bengal-Nagpur railways.

"Sir J. Westland remarks:—

"'We have, moreover, charged off against the revenue account and set aside 532 lakhs in the form of a reduction or avoidance of debt—that is, we possess this sum as a sort of accumulated surplus of revenue over and above the forward total of our ordinary surpluses. I need not say that this is a far better position than what was considered in any way probable when the famine insurance policy was initiated, for the anticipation then was that we should actually spend about 15 crores upon famine relief in ten years and not have any part of it in hand in the shape either of completed works or of money unspent. The improvement is due, for the most part, to the fact that we have during these 15 years, been much more free from famines than we in any way anticipated. To what extent famines may be awaiting us in the future it would be rash to speculate. One thing we do know is that our financial and our protective preparation for them is infinitely superior to what it was at the time when the insurance policy was laid down. While regarding famine insurance as an essential portion of their financial policy the Government consider themselves fully justified in measuring it by a lower standard than in 1880. It has therefore been determined to aim at establishing a standard of reserve sufficient to provide only one crore annually.'

"With regard to the rate of exchange for the ensuing year, Sir J. Westland shows how the value of the rupee gradually rose during the past twelve months from $13\frac{1}{16}$d. to $14\frac{3}{4}$d. He remarks:—

"'The prospects indicated by these figures are decidedly encouraging, but as last year the Government made up their mind to avoid any speculations as to the future, so this year, also, they have determined in their estimates to take no account of the recent, and perhaps yet unexhausted, rise in exchange. They consider it very important in the present circumstances to be on the safe side, and have fixed the exchange to be taken in the Budget estimates at a rate which would certainly have been deemed wise and prudent in the beginning of February, though to many persons it may appear, in the light of more recent events, to err on the safe side. The rate taken is $13\frac{3}{4}$d., being only slightly in advance of the realised rate of the current year. If we could calculate on a rate approaching the present current rate the time would have come for a revision of our general financial position, but we believe that no one will consider our position sufficiently assured for any such measures.'

"With regard to military expenditure, the Budget estimate is 24 crores 29 lakhs, of which nearly 50 lakhs are for preparations for mobilisation. The latter will involve a recurring charge next year of six lakhs, and thereafter of about 13 lakhs annually. It is remarked that military expenditure in India continues to increase and sterling expenditure to decrease. The re-arming of the troops and batteries with new rifles and guns has caused heavy expenditure on military stores, which began in 1887, and sterling expenditure increased from that year onwards to 1893, when it reached the *maximum*. Since then it has declined, the re-armament having been completed. The estimate for special defence works for the ensuing year is only $57\frac{2}{3}$ lakhs, which practically completes the expenditure under this head. Five crores were originally sanctioned for defences, but but only $46\frac{3}{4}$ lakhs will be spent, as it has been decided not to proceed with certain inland defences. But for the mobilisation grant, the army expenditure will be less than it was last year.

"The Budget shows how great will be the activity in railway construction during the ensuing year. The capital expenditure by the State and companies will exceed $11\frac{1}{4}$ crores, while 75 lakhs will be spent on irrigation works. Sixty-two lakhs are allotted for the Mandalay-Kunlong railway.

"With regard to the threatened famine, it is remarked that the failure of the cold weather rains in the north of India, in addition to reducing land revenue and increasing irrigation revenue, has also compelled the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh to provide a sum of seven lakhs for famine relief. The Bengal Government has also repeated next year the provision of half a lakh for famine relief by local bodies which was made in the estimate of this year, but will not be required. This does not, however, indicate any expectation of scarcity in Bengal. No other Government has thought it necessary to make any provision for

famine relief, but in some places, particularly in the North-West Provinces and the native States of Rajputana and Central India, the commencement of the railway works in contemplation is being hastened on with the object of providing work in districts which are threatened with scarcity.

"Sir John Westland, in conclusion, says:

"'Last year my final estimate of the position was that, though we were as yet far from a complete restoration of our fortunes, we might claim to have made a fair amount of progress towards their restoration. Our prospects are now very much more hopeful. Our revenues are advancing, our expenditure is well in hand; but, above all, the rate of exchange shows a tendency to establish itself at a figure which, if maintained, will remove our most serious anxieties. I refrain from any prophecies as to the future, but it is pleasant to know that the direction in which our financial position is changing, which always contains many elements over which we have practically no control, will have to suffer a considerable reverse before we are again in the difficulties which we had to face two years ago.'"

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.

The following list of petitions praying that competitive examinations for the Civil Service of India may be held simultaneously in England and in India are taken from the Report of the Select Committee on Public Petitions:—

1895.

Aug. 19.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Bammanhalli-Hanagal-Dharwar, Taluka District, Bombay Presidency (Sir Charles Dalrymple) ..	315
Aug. 23.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Taluka Karajgy (Sir William Wedderburn)	
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Puntamba (Sir W. Wedderburn)	
Aug. 27.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Cocanada (Sir W. Wedderburn)	98
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Cocanada (Sir W. Wedderburn)	101
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Hospet (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	91
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Jaganadhapuram (Sir William Wedderburn)	100
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madura (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	101
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madura (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	107
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madura (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	107

Total number of petitions 10—Signatures 1,020

1896.

Feb. 13.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Sholapur (Sir W. Wedderburn)	290
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Virapandi (Sir W. Wedderburn)	207
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Gorakhpur (Sir W. Wedderburn)	301
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madras (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	196
Feb. 13.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Pudukota (Sir W. Wedderburn)	407
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Ramanasanmithurum (Sir William Wedderburn)	810
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Rayapuram (Sir W. Wedderburn)	542
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Kuttalam (Sir W. Wedderburn)	111
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Vayalpad (Sir W. Wedderburn)	142

Total number of Petitions 9—Signatures 3,096

Taking together the returns for August, 1895, and February last, we find that 19 petitions have been presented, containing 4,116 signatures.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE POONA CONGRESS.

In our February number we published, from such information as was then available, the text of the Resolutions passed at the Eleventh Indian National Congress at Poona. Having now received the authorised text, we notify the following *errata*:—

Resolution V., line 5, for "from" read "by"; line 7, after "Council" insert "on the subject."

Resolution VI., line 7, for "most respectfully" read "again"; line 8, for "entreats" read "urges."

Resolution VII., line 4, for "natives" read "people."

Resolution X., line 3, for "public Legislation" read "Legislature."

Resolution XII., line 8, after "Congress" insert "once again"; line 11, for "another" read "the other."

Resolution XVII., at end of line 2, insert "third class"; line 3, after "passages" insert "from whom the largest portion of railway revenue is derived"; line 5, for "their redress" read "an early redress of their grievances."

Resolution XVIII., line 11, for "forest" read "forests."

Resolution XX., at end of line 4, insert "or that fees in educational institutions wholly or partially supported by the State should be increased."

Resolution XXI., line 3, after "twenties" insert "from Excise duty."

Resolution XXII., omit clause (j) including sections (i) and (ii).

Resolution XXIII., line 3, after "India" insert "and also for the expense of the Joint General Secretary's office."

Resolution XXV., line 2, after "Secretary" insert "and appoints Mr. D. E. Wacha to be its Joint General Secretary."

Reviews.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

Charles Bradlaugh: a Record of his Life and Work. By his daughter, Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner. With an account of his Parliamentary Struggle, Politics, and Teachings, by John M. Robertson. In 2 vols. Second edition. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

Though this remarkable biography is now in a second edition, there needs no apology for recalling attention to it. So distinctive was the position taken up by Mr. Bradlaugh in the life and politics of his time, that it is especially satisfactory to have

a permanent record of the real facts of his career on unimpeachable authority. It was quite inevitable that he should be largely misunderstood and frequently misrepresented, honestly as well as dishonestly. Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner, with immense labour and unwearied patience, supported by filial affection and admiration, has cleared away a vast number of injurious fictions concerning the life and action of her distinguished father; and Mr. John M. Robertson has set forth in the clearest manner the meaning and purpose of Mr. Bradlaugh's political, social, and religious teachings, and the history of his parliamentary struggle. Between them, they have drawn as accurate a portrait of the man as can be hoped for—a portrait whose lines will certainly stand out more marked and pleasing as time lays the dust of prejudiced controversies and clears away the haze of unreason and intolerance.

We do not propose to follow in detail the events of Mr. Bradlaugh's career—his family circumstances; his juvenile collision with senseless and unsympathetic professors of religion; his early struggles as office-boy, wharf clerk and cashier, "coal merchant" and soldier; his laborious lecturings and debatings on a thousand platforms, on religious, social, and political questions; his sufferings in person, reputation, and estate, from his uncompromising maintenance of unpopular opinions that he thoroughly believed to be right. These things have been generally set forth already, and any one who really cares for them will turn with interest to the full and true record preserved by Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner. They represent a most varied, strenuous, and sincere spirit struggling all but hopelessly against the adamantine barriers of petrified prejudices, social narrowness, political obfuscation, and religious fanaticism, under the burden of inadequate material means. Mr. Bradlaugh may, not unfrequently, have been in the wrong on the merits; he may have been still more frequently in the wrong in point of procedure. He was not much of a strategist; he always delivered his attack right on the enemy's front. No doubt the plan has its advantages in the long run, but the run is a very long one, and it seldom pays the individual in his own life-time. There is no cause for wonder that Mr. Bradlaugh died before his time, worn out in the complicated and harassing struggle, strong man though he was. The forces of a traditional society are too powerful to be shocked by the direct assault of any one man. Sir Hugh Rose did not dash himself against the western face of the stronghold of Jhansi, or against the sandstone precipices of the fortress of Gwalior. Still, Bradlaugh's methods testify to his personal convictions and sincerity of action, and invest his career with the quality of heroic single-mindedness. This feeling is deeply accentuated by his constant involvement in the trammels of poverty. The straightforward narrative of his daughter happily disposes for ever of the injurious aspersions of thoughtless or venomous opponents on his motives and actions; and, in particular, Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner finally places in their true light, at painful cost to her personal feelings, the real relations between Bradlaugh and his wife, and Bradlaugh and his brother, William Robert Bradlaugh. His outer face, ironclad to the hostile world, contrasts dramatically with his inner face, bright and soft to his relatives and friends. Taken all in all, Bradlaugh was a strong and sincere man, often wrong-headed, oftener still in the right, but always having the courage of his opinions; and, if he too frequently made his own path difficult, he has in many ways rendered the road more easy for the progress of his successors in most of his various lines of activity.

Mr. Robertson has done his share of the work of this memorial of Bradlaugh in very thorough fashion, notwithstanding considerable discursiveness. Like the purely biographical part, this critical and explanatory part ought to be carefully read and considered. We cannot tackle even all the main points, but must content ourselves with the extraction of a few illustrative examples of Mr. Robertson's positions. Thus:

"Bradlaugh was not the untrained Atheist of the Theistic imagination, who may be confounded with a quotation from Kant by one of the personages of Mrs. Ward's religious vaudevilles. . . . . Beginning as a boy to defend his Theism in debate, he saw it demolished by one of those born debaters who are found every now and then among the working class. . . . . But he did not trust to "mother-wit," his own or another's. He read all the philosophic literature he could lay hands on; in particular he became a close student of Spinoza. A clergyman of my acquaintance maintains that to the end he was a Spinozist. It would be less misleading to say that he employed much of the method of Spinoza to establish the Atheism to which Spinoza's doctrine practically leads, while always scrupulously recognising that Spinoza formulated Pantheism and professed only to modify the God-idea. . . . . All the psychological line of argument, as put by Kant and his adaptors, is fully and patiently met by Bradlaugh in his section of the "Freethinker's Text-Book," which deals in turn with all the main pleas of orthodoxy."

Mr. Robertson claims that "while Bradlaugh was an exact thinker and reasoner, he distinguished himself above all the rationalists of his time by the energy and persistence with which he sought to bring his philosophy home to the popular mind." "For him, creed was action, and action creed."

"That a doctrine is false was to him a reason for exposing it as such; and, though as a utilitarian he held that truth is the best policy, he did not wait for the demonstration before choosing his course. He had, in fact, that love of truth for its own sake which is the inspiration of all scientific progress; but he had it without restriction, or at least with as little restriction as can well be. . . . . He would give facilities for all conscientious truth-seeking whatever, barring only random disclosures of sensational facts with no better motive than

INSECT BITES OR STINGS, CHAFED SKIN, PILES, CUTS, SORE EYES, SUNBURN, EARACHE, NEURALGIC AND RHEUMATIC PAINS, THROAT COLDS, AND SKIN AILMENTS, QUICKLY RELIEVED BY USE OF

CALVERT'S CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp, and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

sensation, or with no likelihood of edification to balance the likelihood of the reverse. As to the great themes of belief and discussion in all ages, he simply could not think that human welfare is promoted by maintaining beliefs known to be false. He was a democrat in religion as well as in politics."

"The practice of boycotting for opinion's sake he detested and denounced, and never in any way resorted to."

"He even carried the spirit of "tolerance" to an extreme degree in his own affairs, being careful, as his daughter testifies, to avoid giving his children anything like specific anti-theological teaching, on the ground that the opinions of the young ought not to be stereotyped for them on points which they ought to reconsider for themselves when they grow up. In intercourse with those about him he was equally scrupulous; and all the contributors to his journal can tell how complete was the freedom he gave them to express in its pages opinions from which he dissented. In this he was far superior to many who have aspersed him as overbearing. It was a point of honour with him to give a hearing in his columns to all manner of opposition to his own views; and no man was ever less apt to let his philosophical convictions bias him in his practical or political relations with people of another way of thinking."

Bradlaugh's political doctrine may be broadly described "as a demand for the fullest admission of the people to the rights of self-government, and, further, the application of the powers thus acquired to the removal or reform of all laws framed in the interest of the upper few. This was the ideal he had formed for himself in his youth, and he declined to substitute for it the ideal of Socialism, which had begun to be vaguely popular towards the end of his life. The refusal rested on his experience, and on his character." We pass by the other points in his political career to notice what Mr. Robertson says about Bradlaugh's interest in India.

"In virtue of the qualities which made him a warm friend of Ireland, Bradlaugh was all his life, and in latter years still more warmly, the friend of India. All his instincts of justice and sympathy were moved by the spectacle of that vast congeries of immemorially immature races, ruled by a bureaucracy of Englishmen, none of whom would for a moment be trusted to exercise similar power over their fellow-countrymen, but all of whom collectively are assumed by their countrymen to need next to no supervision when ruling a "lower" race. Again and again Bradlaugh protested, as other Englishmen had protested before him, against the inveterate apathy with which the House of Commons regards Indian questions. . . . .

"Bradlaugh was under no delusions as to the present political capacity of the Indian races. He perfectly recognised their bias to rhetoric and their immaturity of character, as well as the enormous difficulties in the way of their political amalgamation. Hence his program for them was an extremely gradual introduction of the principle of self-rule. . . . . The Home Rule principle, which was for Bradlaugh a principle of universal virtue, however different the degree of its application to a given case at a given moment, must in time be wrought out in India as elsewhere, if only it goes forward in the West, and the West keeps up its growing intercourse with the East. And it was one of his many political merits to have been one of the first to see this not only abstractly but in the concrete.'

Mr. Robertson goes at great length into the history of the deplorable Parliamentary struggle. That we must leave on one side. Take this glimpse of Bradlaugh on the platform:

"As a lecturer, of course, he was vigorous to the highest degree. Many of those who have heard him at the height of his powers will agree to the verdict that he was by far the most powerful English orator of his time. There was something overwhelming in his force of speech when impassioned; it lifted an audience from its feet like a storm, and raised their intellectual conviction to a white heat of enthusiasm for the truth it conveyed. Other speakers of his day may have been as thrillingly impressive at their best moments; but he had great passages in nearly every speech, and rarely faced an audience without electrifying it."

"Of his influence on his followers those can best speak who have mixed with them."

"Personal and magnetic as it was, it depended for its continuance on the unvarying nobility of his appeal to the best instincts—to courage, honour, justice, and the love of truth. Hundreds of men—men to whom the generality of pulpit sermons are either inane commonplaces or maudlin nonsense—can testify to the fashion in which he stirred them to high sympathies and generous determinations, making life for all of them, however narrow their sphere, a vista of worthy activities and abiding consolations."

These extracts are little more than chance indications of some of the characteristics of these exhaustive volumes, but we hope they may suffice to show that the work constitutes a most interesting memorial of one of the most distinctive careers of the century. It presents Mr. Bradlaugh in manner as he lived; and no fair-minded reader can rise from its perusal without a deepened respect for its distinguished subject. Both the authors, in their different ways, have thrown a much-needed light upon the life and ways of thought of a man that suffered more than any other public man of his time from gross misrepresentation in every possible respect. The voice of calumny is not readily stilled; but these volumes ought to do much towards a juster criticism of Bradlaugh at the hands of all honest men, however much they may disagree with his principles or his practice. They will be much prized by those who knew his private worth and personal sincerity, whether or not seeing eye to eye with him on all points of opinion and belief.

BIBLIOGRAPHY of ARTICLES in MONTHLY and QUARTERLY MAGAZINES on INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1896.

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). "Medical Aid for Indian Women." Rogers, Alexander, "Indian Peasant Settlements." Chatterjee, B. C. (the late), "The Globe of Gold."

New Review. "The Revision of the Indian Tariff."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1896.

Maclean, James Mackenzie ...."A Guide to Bombay: Historical, Statistical, and Descriptive." (Street and Co.)...........

Shiel, M. P. ...."The Rájá's Sapphire." (Ward, Lock)............... 2s. 6d

Makay, J. C., F.G.S. ...."Light Railways for the United Kingdom, India, and the Colonies." (Crosby, Lockwood) ...... 15s. 0d.

Bose, Pramatha Nath, B.Sc., F.G.S. .."A History of Hindu Civilization during British Rule." Vol. III—Intellectual Condition. (Kegan Paul) .... 7s. 6d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.